


WHITE (T. J.)

A discussion of the
charges preferred in the
Dugan Controversy

x x x x x x x



A DISCUSSION
OF THE
CHARGES PREFERRED IN THE
DUGAN CONTROVERSY:
WITH A
DEMONSTRATION OF THE FACTS
IN THE CASE.

By T. J. WHITE, M. D.

29795
ST. LOUIS, MO.

1846.

Page 3—Line 21, for verbally, read *verbally*.

" 7—Line 21, for 15th, read 13.

" 9—Line 32, for marvelous, read *marvellous*.

" 12—Fourth line from the bottom, for colossal, read *colossal*.

" 18—Put quotation marks at the end of the 6th line, after 1844, in the 5th line.

" 18—7th line from the bottom, read *cœthes*, for *cacœthes*.

" 24—Line 7th and 40th for North, read *South*.

" 28—Line 22, for county, read *Circuit*.

" 30—Line 7 from bottom, read *Maelstrom*, for *mælstrom*; and on 25th line, read *his* instead of *theirs*.

" 37—Line 14, instead of a period insert a *comma*.

" 44—Line 29, for "as I," read *I as*.

INTRODUCTION.

I owe an explanation to the public, for having allowed the gross charges of Drs. Adreon and Reyburn, against me, to stand so long unanswered. I thought it best to *finish the job* while I was about it; and it takes longer to *prove* the truth, than to *state* a falsehood.

But I was obliged to wait several weeks after completing the body of this article, for a letter from Rev. Mr. Light, who is out of the city, and whose letter is very important to a correct understanding of the case, as all will see who read it. The article was prepared without reference to that, and before it was received. As it was important, and as every word *he* says will command universal and perfect credence in this community, and as it amply "covers" the whole ground, I have inserted it entire, in the Appendix.

Were I to publish all the documents I have obtained, entire, I should be obliged still greatly to increase the length of this article—already too long. To avoid this, I have merely used *extracts* from the testimony I have procured, arranging them under the several falsehoods to which they refer: and though the full force of the letters I have received is not thus perceived; still, I sacrifice this to brevity. The original documents are all in my possession, and any one can see that I have correctly quoted them, by calling at my office.

I am the more reconciled with my delay in getting out this article, by the opportunity thus afforded me of noticing an effusion of the *same clique*, recently issued under the auspices and *ostensible* paternity of Dr. Adreon. In the Appendix will be found some notice of it—more, in fact, than it deserves from any one.

I here owe an apology to those friends who have kindly furnished me attestations of the facts in this disputed case, for having introduced testimony to sustain their credibility. The veracity of every one of them is, I well know, unimpeachable; but the character of my assailants, makes it necessary to sustain the testimony of those whose acquaintance is limited, by the certificates of those who are known to the whole community, and that even *they* will hardly dare charge with "perjury" or "falsehood."

In the July number of the St. Louis Medical and Surgical Journal I published a vindication of myself from the aspersions and misrepresentations of Thomas Reyburn, S. W. Adreon and others, contained in a paper on "tuphlo-enteritis," read by Dr. Reyburn before the Medical Society in St. Louis, in '43, and received as evidence in the late case of Mrs. Mary Dugan; and an editorial by "McP.," in the May number of said Journal; in which publication, I proved by testimony of the most irrefutable character, the following propositions, viz:

First. That Dr. Adreon had abandoned the case of Mrs. Dugan for three days after the operation was performed by him.

Second. That during the abandonment of the case by Dr. A., I, in connection with Dr. Knox, was called in by request of Mrs. Dugan, by Rev. Geo. C. Light, &c., &c.

Third. That there was no "volunteer deputation of Doctors."

Fourth. That as soon as Dr. A. returned, I gave up the case and refused to attend.

Fifth. That Mary Dugan never was cured and is now suffering from the effects of the disease.

Sixth. That Dr. Adreon knew when she left for the upper country in '40, and also that she was not cured, advising her to that trip, both verbally and by letter, for the purpose of curing her.

Seventh. That I was her attending physician from the time of her return in '44, until the present time.

Eighth. That in that capacity, and in that alone, I invited medical men to see her.

Ninth. That I had no agency, directly nor indirectly, in procuring the suit for mal-praxis, but on the contrary, did all I could with her to prevent it.

Tenth. That there was no attempt on the part of any one to "wrest the patient from Dr. A."

Eleventh. That my conduct was scrupulously courteous, not only in '40, but also since her return to the city, and at the trial.

Twelfth. That Adreon, Reyburn & Co. have been the assailants, and not myself.

Fearing the withering scorn of the community, from the effects of the overwhelming proof contained in that article, it will be recollected by the public, that Dr. Reyburn announced in the city papers, "that a full refutation would be given to my article," in the vain hope thereby of staving the indignation of the public mind against him, as a *convicted slanderer and wilful libeller*, unworthy the association or confidence of high minded and honorable men. His promised "refutation" has appeared in a supplement to that Journal; and it now becomes my duty again to notice him for awhile; not that he has sustained in the least his *swaggering* declaration, but to show to what low depths of degradation and infamy, these men have consigned themselves: and, in doing this, I

fear I shall again offend the polite ears of this deputy slanderer, (Dr. R.,) with my "coarse language"; inasmuch as the *coarseness* of the *conduct* of those individuals requires terms of a like character; and as I am accustomed to call things by their right names. No doubt it would grate less harshly upon the ears of this refined gentleman, were I to substitute romancing for falsehood when speaking of him, and possibly I may so far accommodate him as to distinguish him as "the romancing Sec'y. of Doctor Adreon."

I now propose shewing conclusively, by irrefragable record evidence and the testimony of competent witnesses, that Dr. Reyburn's statements are not only "based upon perjury" (if Dr. Adreon has made affidavit to his letter published in Reyburn's supplement, page 25, as stated in page 10 of said supplement,) but that Dr. Reyburn himself has been guilty of perjury, (possibly not intentional—false statements under the sanction of a judicial oath, evincing a deplorable deficiency of surgical knowledge, if not an equally deplorable obliquity of moral sense and enlightened conscience;) *perjury*, I repeat, in several instances; and of some fifty odd separate and distinct falsehoods, all of which are susceptible of proof in a court of justice; and that his witness, rather principal party and co-defendant in the case, S. W. Adreon, is guilty of base perjury in almost every sentence of that letter; (if affidavit has been made to it, as intimated by Dr. Reyburn,) which is also susceptible of proof in a court of justice, and for which I am responsible.

I now proceed to lay before the reader, separately and distinctly, the *most prominent* of these falsehoods, in their regular order, from No. 1 upward, with the proof of their falsity immediately subscribed.

Falsehood No. 1.—Dr. Reyburn, page 553, May No. St. Louis Medical and Surgical Journal, says "That a volunteer deputation of Doctors," (of which I was one,) "visited Mrs. Dugan, and gratuitously gave her their opinions."

I have proven this to be absolutely false by the clear and incontestable statements of the Rev. Jos. Tabor, Sarah Waddingham, Franklin Knox, M. D., and Rev. Geo. C. Light, on pages 69, 70, 71, 72 and 73 of the July No. of the St. Louis Medical and Surgical Journal; and the oath of the patient herself, Mrs. Mary Dugan, page 65. In addition to which I present first the testimony of Mrs. Capt. Stilwell, viz: "To my certain knowledge it was by her (Mrs. Dugan's) express 'authority' Rev. Mr. Light was requested to have Drs. White and Knox visit Mrs. D., and it was the wish of every friend she had, as she was grossly neglected, &c. &c."

Second.—Mrs. Francis Burk, the mother of Mrs. Stilwell, says: "I know the statement of my daughter to be true, personally, from my mother, Mrs. Eddy, and from Mrs. Dugan herself." As to the credibility of these witnesses, let the following speak: "I know Mrs. Burke, she is a member of our Church, in high standing, and of undoubted veracity. I also know her daughter, Mrs. Stilwell, who is also of high standing, and of unquestionable *veracity*; and both possess property."

Signed, "N. G. BERRYMAN, Pastor of the Mound M. E. Church."

Thirdly.—Mrs. Polly Sly states: "I know the statement of Mrs. Capt. Stilwell to be true, from personal knowledge." For the charac-

ter and credibility of Mrs. Sly, I am authorized to refer to her neighbor, Wm. Waddingham, Esq.

Fourthly.—Extract from Thos. F. Dugan's oath: "She (Mrs. Dugan) wished Dr. White to be sent for, and requested Mr. Light to do so" which statement is likewise confirmed by David Bardo.

Fifthly.—F. E. Robinson and Elizabeth Robinson say: "It was by Mrs. Dugan's special request that Drs. White and Knox were called in, when abandoned by Dr. Adreon in 1840." Of the Robinson's, Joshua Tucker says: "I know F. E. Robinson and Elizabeth Robinson; he is an elder in the North Presbyterian Church, a man of undoubted veracity, high respectability, and some property." Dated September 20th, '46.

Rev. Wm. Homes, late pastor of the North Presbyterian Church, in a letter dated, St. Louis, October 24th, 1846, says: "This is to certify that Frederic E. Robinson and wife are well known to me. I have had a personal and intimate acquaintance with both for nearly three years. They are persons of consistent, christian character, worthy of implicit confidence, and their word upon any subject, when they may be called to testify, or certify to the truth, cannot be doubted.

WILLIAM HOMES."

Sixthly.—Mary Ann Reinhimer says: "Drs. White and Knox came and took charge of the case, at her (Mrs. Dugan's) request, and that of the Rev. Mr. Light;" and Jno. G. Myer and Barbara Myer say that "other physicians were sent for by her (Mrs. Dugan's) request." The credibility and standing of these witnesses are shewn by a letter from Frederick J. Lynch, viz:

"I am well acquainted with John George Myer and his family, one of whom is Mary Ann Reinhimer, and from my own knowledge state that they are truthful and highly respectable."

Signed:

F. J. LYNCH.

Falsehood No. 2.—Dr. Reyburn, page 254, of the May No. Medical and Surgical Journal, says, that one of the Doctors said, "It's a hernia, the Dr. has cut a gut, was the refined expression of another; take a dose of castor oil, says a third, and you will see it will pass through the opening in the groin, and not by the natural passage. The volunteer consultation doomed her to certain death—and one of them kindly asked permission to hold a post-mortem on her mangled remains."

I have proven beyond the possibility of a doubt, by all the witnesses previously referred to, that no such unprofessional language was used by Drs. Henry, Trudeau, Knox or myself, which is not controverted by a single witness in Dr. Reyburn's supplement. No, not even by his very *convenient and plastic* witness and principal, S. W. Adreon; but, on the contrary, it has been clearly shown that the very expressions imputed to the "Volunteer deputation of Doctors," were the identical expressions used by the attending physicians, viz: "She would never have another natural operation," said one; author, Dr. Adreon; proof, Mrs. Waddingham, page 70, July No. Medical and Surgical Journal. "The Doctor has cut a gut, (or bowels,) was the refined expression of another"—not one of the "deputation," but the refined Beaumont—proof, Dr. Trudeau.

Falsehood No. 3.—Dr. Reyburn, page 55, May No. Medical and

Surgical Journal says: "The volunteer party attempted to wrest the patient from the original attendants, &c., &c."

It will be seen by reference to the same ample testimony (the witnesses previously referred to) that no effort was made to wrest the patient from Dr. Adreon. On the contrary, the patient was voluntarily given up, as soon as Dr. Adreon resumed his attendance on her. F. E. Robinson and Elizabeth Robinson in reference to this, say: "Dr. White and Knox did not seek to have Dr. Adreon discharged, or to have themselves retained."

Falsehood No. 4.—Dr. Reyburn, page 555, (of this veracious report,) in the May No. of Medical and Surgical Journal, states, "that he (Dr. Adreon,) voluntarily declined any further attendance; but at this, the patient (Mrs. Dugan) became greatly alarmed, and wept, declaring her unbounded confidence in his skill, and begged him to continue his attendance." This has, also, been proven in my former article by most of the evidence to which I have alluded, (by 8 or 10 witnesses, at least,) to be untrue. On the contrary, Mrs. Dugan did repeatedly complain of Dr. Adreon's course of treatment, charging that he had ignorantly and basely maltreated her; nay, "*ruined her*" by his want of skill. F. E. and Elizabeth Robinson likewise say, that "Dr. Adreon used abusive language to Mrs. Dugan, and very much neglected her." Mrs. Capt. Stilwell and Mrs. Burke allege that "she (Mrs. Dugan) had been grossly neglected by Dr. Adreon;" and Mrs. Polly Sly confirms this statement. Thos. Dugan also, on oath, says: "My mother complained of Dr. Adreon, and wished other physicians sent for," which is confirmed by David Bardo.

Mrs. Nathaniel Childs, Sr., also distinctly recollects each of the above particulars, as I am authorized by her to state.

Falsehood No. 5.—Page 555, May No. St. Louis Medical and Surgical Journal, Dr. Reyburn says, that he, "the narrator, saw this case in the middle of the month of June; the patient's health was then re-established, and on the 7th of July the patient *was perfectly cured*," and Dr. Adreon, in his letter, page 26 of Reyburn's Supplement, says: "that the wound was in the condition above described (that is, perfectly cured) in July, 1840."

Now are these statements of Drs. Reyburn and Adreon true or false? That they are *absolutely and unequivocally false*; and that Drs. Reyburn and Adreon knew them to be so at the time they penned them, no one, not even the most *sceptical*, can for a single moment doubt. But for the proofs: first, the oath of Mrs. Mary Dugan, the patient herself: "When I left St. Louis in 1840, my side was still discharging freely the contents of the bowels, and had never closed, even partially, up to the hour I left for the upper country, (page 65, July No. Med. and Surg. Jour.)

Second.—Page 74 of same No. Journal, Thos. S. and Ann Coxé say: "We saw Mrs. Mary Dugan, the patient, the day before she left—the 12th July, 1840; and then she was very sick and not able to walk, her wound in the groin discharging freely of matter from the bowels, which fact was known to Dr. Adreon, and on the 7th July, '40, when I learn she was reported to have been cured, she was at that time in the same diseased condition, only much worse then, than at other times; and

recollect that very day that she was very ill." Though the credibility of these two witnesses has been attacked upon the ground alone of "poverty and ignorance," by Dr. Reyburn, on page 12 of his Supplement, yet the following attestation of their standing will effectually put that matter to rest; independent of the ample manner in which they have been sustained by those who have more *wealth*, though possibly not quite as much "*sarcasm*," "*refinement*," and fine wit, as Dr. Reyburn: certainly, however, more common sense and honesty than that gentleman.

"We know Thos. S. Coxe to be a sober, industrious, honest and truthful man, and as intelligent, or more so, than mechanics are ordinarily."

(Signed,)

JOSHUA TUCKER,
C. WM. LIGHTNER.

I am permitted to refer to Mr. Gaty, of the firm of Gaty, McCune & Glasby, for the same facts, as he labored for him for five years.

Thirdly.—Mrs. Capt. Stillwell remarks: "I saw her (Mrs. Dugan) the very day she left here, and the opening made by Dr. Adreon was then discharging. She could not walk. A few months after this time, ~~Dr.~~ Dr. Adreon remarked to me that Mrs. Dugan *was not well* when she left St. Louis, July, 1840, *and never would be well.*" ~~Dr.~~

Fourthly.—Mrs. Capt. McCourtney says: "On the 15th July, 1840, and sometime previous to that, I know she (Mrs. Dugan) was confined to her bed and very ill, her wound in the right side where she was operated upon, discharging matter from the bowels at that time, that her physician, Dr. Adreon, had said to her that she would not die in getting up the river, although I thought myself and told her she would die, if she attempted to go."

For the *truthfulness* and *standing* of Mrs. McCourtney, I am permitted to refer to Mr. and Mrs. Waddingham, her neighbors.

Fifthly.—Mrs. Mary Ann Reinhimer observes: "I examined her (Mrs. Dugan) in July, 1840, and her wound in the side was then discharging freely. She was placed on a dray and hauled to the river, not being able to travel at all, without assistance."

Sixthly.—Jno. G. Myer and Barbara Myer, say: "The facts above stated are true, and we cannot be mistaken. She (Mrs. Dugan,) was not cured when she left St. Louis, 1840, was hauled to the river on a dray. Mrs. Dugan rented of us."

Seventhly.—Frances Burke also confirms these statements, thus: "I know the statement of my daughter Mrs. Capt. Stillwell, personally, to be true."

Eighthly.—F. E. Robinson and Elizabeth Robinson observe: "The wound in the right side was discharging the contents of the bowels the day she started up the country, and she was very ill not only then, but during the month of June and up to July 13th, 1840, to our certain knowledge, was never cured. We saw her off on the dray, and saw her wound the day she started."

Ninthly.—Thos. Dugan, on oath, says: "I went to Dr. Adreon's office the day the boat was about starting, by his request, to get medicine for dressing my mother's wound. He gave me a pound of finely powdered charcoal and barks for that purpose. I recollect distinctly as the boat was well nigh leaving me, I went with her up to Jefferson

City, where she was landed. I walked out to my uncle's, and he brought in a wagon for her. She could not walk to the boat. Her wound was discharging then, and, as we were poor, I had to take away the dressings from the wound. This wound had never been healed a single moment up to this time, nor for years afterwards. She was worse during the early part of July, '40, than before, and we all doubted if she would not die, even before she reached home."

Tenthly.—David Bardo, in reference to Thomas Dugan's oath as above quoted, says: "I hereby affirm, that the above statement is true. I was in St. Louis when she left, July 13th, 1840; her wound was then discharging freely, and her health was very bad. It was not expected that she would be able to reach her destination."

Eleventh.—Polly Sly states that "she (Mrs. Dugan) was not cured—that she was hauled to the river on a dray."

Then it would appear from these thirteen distinct statements, some on oath, of persons of *wealth*, character, and undoubted veracity, that there cannot be even a shadow of a doubt on this branch of the subject, viz: That Mary Dugan was not "*perfectly cured*," when she left here in 1840, as stated by these veracious reporters, Adreon and Reyburn. These men have not brought forward a single fact, or a solitary witness in opposition to this formidable array of testimony. But how does Dr. Reyburn meet Mrs. Dugan's oath on the subject of her cure? Listen, worthy reader, to the following extract from Dr. R.'s Supplement, page 6, viz: "This is, to my own knowledge, grossly false, and my testimony in court and my paper prove how perjured it is." "Truly a convenient way this Doctor has of proving his own statement. First he makes a statement, and then, when it is proven false, falls back upon his own report and testimony to prove, what? Why, that he is correct, and that Mrs. Dugan is a "liberal swearer and perjured witness." But this woman, though *poor*, and not quite so well educated as our refined Dr. R., is enabled by the overwhelming testimony adduced in support of her statement, to hurl back upon him his coarse epithets of "liberal swearer and perjured witness:" thus *his* "impotent artillery" is made to "recoil upon himself" and this self-elated lion of the mushroom aristocracy cowers before this "poor," "ignorant" and "degraded" witness—"a *petitio principii*."

Falsehood No. 6.—Dr. Reyburn's supplement, page 2, says: "This affidavit (Mrs. Dugan's, page 64, July No. of the Journal,) is not a true statement, because its material details are not corroborated by any physician who examined her in 1840, not even by Dr. White himself!" and Dr. Adreon, in his letter, page 26, of Dr. R.'s Supplement, says: "The history of the disease given in Mrs. Dugan's affidavit was never, to my knowledge, admitted in 1840."

Now, to shew these statements to be utterly false, Dr. Knox and myself visited this patient in 1840, and recollect distinctly that she gave us the same history of her symptoms then, as detailed in her affidavit; these symptoms, clearly indicating hernia, and recognized as such by Dr. McCabe in 1840, who was invited to see her then by Dr. Adreon himself. It was also recognized at that time as hernia by Dr. Mullowny. In further confirmation of the fact, F. E. Robinson and his wife, Elizabeth Robinson, remark, that "the general statement, by Mrs. Dugan of

her case, page 64, of the July No. of Med. & Surg. Journal is true; and as given 1840. She (Mrs. Dugan) stated to us, at that time, (1840) *that she had hernia*, distinctly, and said it became worse by lifting a kettle of clothes from the fire; that she felt at that time something give way, and was worse ever afterwards. Her brother-in-law told us before she came down to St. Louis that it was hernia; and every person then considered it so, as well as ourselves." 3dly. Mrs. Capt. Stilwell remarks: "I read, page 64, the account given of her disease, (Mrs. Dugan's) in the July No. Med. & Surg. Journal. It is the same history in all the material facts, which she gave me in 1840, and I know the disease from comparison and personal inspection." In reference to this point, I am authorized to refer to Mrs. Nathaniel Childs, Sr., (mother of N. Childs of the Bank) who recognizes the symptoms as detailed by her in her affidavit, as the same identically, as mentioned to her (Mrs. C.) in 1840: moreover, she is acquainted with the disease and told Dr. Adreon before he operated in 1840, "that it was a clear case of hernia;" that there was "nothing but the bowels and contents in the tumor, and not to cut."

It will, therefore, be seen from the testimony I have adduced, that the symptoms of disease, as detailed by Mrs. Dugan in the affidavit, are the same that were given by her in 1840 to myself, Dr. Knox, Mrs. N. Childs, Mr. and Mrs. Robinson, Mrs. Capt. Stilwell, Rev. G. C. Light, and every other person with whom she conversed, excepting, it seems, the veracious reporters—Drs. Adreon and Reyburn. Now, is it not, indeed most strange, that Mrs. Dugan in 1840, when conversing with those who lived in the same house with her—with her friends and relatives, should give them a detail of symptoms, that convinced them she had hernia; and yet, when Drs. Adreon and Reyburn appear before her, all these undoubted *hernial symptoms* vanish, and in their stead appear symptoms indicating a then new and strange disease; and then again, so soon as Dr. Adreon abandoned her, and other physicians are called in, she returns to her first relation of symptoms. This is indeed a marvelous story that those worthy Doctors would have us believe; that a woman laboring under disease, would tell her friends with whom she had daily and almost hourly intercourse, ministering to her wants, would tell them she felt thus and thus, and then, when Dr. A. is called in, *deny* that she had such symptoms!

But this Dr. Munchausen goes on to assert a still stranger phenomenon—that she (Mrs. Dugan) "is of the lowest grade of intelligence, consequently could not recollect her symptoms at the end of six years." A patient laboring under hernia for seven years previous to 1840, could not recollect the self-same symptoms from 1840 to 46!!!! Most sapient and logical reasoner!! a very Aristotle as well as Esculapius!!!—a master of dialectics as well as of physic. If there is anything that the human mind can grasp and *dwell upon*, (though it be of the "lowest grade of intelligence,") it is a series of symptoms, with which the body may have been afflicted for years. It is a remark of all medical philosophers and of every physician of the least experience, ay, of "the very lowest grade of intelligence," except Dr. Reyburn, that when the patient ceases to recollect all other things, the features of chronic disease are vivid and prominent to the mind's eye. Yet this *wiseacre*, this

most brilliant genius, has discovered the important fact that a patient "weak in body and mind" cannot recollect the symptoms of her disease for six years, though she has been laboring under them for that length of time and seven years besides; iterating and reiterating them as proven, during this entire period! Yet, when Dr. Adreon, his secretary, Dr. Reyburn, and the Carpenter visited Mrs. Dugan (matters being done up *Brown*), and she described a *something*, (not hernia,) for it was hard, was it not Mrs. D., &c., &c. Though "weak in body and mind" she was enabled to point out in a most clear manner a series of symptoms proving unquestionably it was not hernia, but "tuphlo enteritis"—a disease totally unknown even to the attending physicians, at that time; and, according to one of their number, Dr. Sykes, up to a much later period. Then, O modern Cicero of the profession, Hippocrates—thou, who disdainest to walk in the beaten track of science, tell us how it is that a patient so "weak in body and mind" as not to bear in mind symptoms under which she has been laboring for 13 years, yet can give quite an accurate history of the symptoms of "tuphlo enteritis"—a disease so obscure in its nature that it had for nearly 6,000 years eluded the most erudite researches of the ablest pathologists of all ages, till 1836, and never published in America till 1840; the very year that this case occurred to this enlightened *clique*? Wonderful! wonderful indeed; that Mary Dugan, a patient, "weak in body and mind," could have described to these wiseacres, one of them a dentist ("tho' practising the higher branches of his profession,") a complicated disease, the discovery of which has entwined about the brow of a Byrne, a wreath of never fading glory, so accurately as to enable all of them at once, almost intuitively to recognize it as "tuphlo enteritis;" though she was of "the lowest grade of intelligence," and "weak in body and mind!" No, Dr. Reyburn had a paper to read, and three years after the occurrence of this case (when these gentlemen supposed their errors, with the unfortunate patient, were deposited some few feet below the surface of the earth,) "tuphlo enteritis" was spoken of for the first time, as has been recently acknowledged by one of the attendants, and selected by Dr. Reyburn as an appropriate subject for self-laudation, and aggrandizement, before the Missouri Medical Society!

Whether this unfortunate old lady had hernia or tuphlo enteritis is no matter of mine. It is with them, their conscience and their God. If they can satisfy the one and reconcile their conduct to the other, be it so. No one would have been more willing than myself to have "thrown the mantle of charity over the errors of my professional brethren," had it not been for the repeated efforts of these gentlemen to make me the *scape-goat* of their gross blunders; it being found necessary to invoke the aid of professional "hate and jealousy," to cover their own retreat. But notwithstanding the "*mysterious whisperings*," gross and false insinuations, the *unmanly*, *skulking* and *cowardly* attacks made and urged with extraordinary pertinacity, from 1840 to the trial in '46, against my professional reputation, I, for the honor and dignity of the medical profession, forbore uttering a single murmur, till their charges occupied "a local habitation and a name."

Falsehood No. 7.—Dr. Adreon's letter, page 25, Reyburn's Supplement, "I did not neglect her, as she (Mrs. Dugan) avers, nor did she

ever express any dissatisfaction, or want of confidence towards me, while treating her case."

This is proven to be false by the letters of Dr. Knox, Sarah Waddingham, page 70, July No. Med. & Surg. Jour., and the affidavit of Mrs. Dugan, page 66 of same. In addition to this, F. E. Robinson and Elizabeth Robinson state emphatically that Dr. Adreon used abusive language towards her and had very much neglected her. "The want of attention was gross till Dr. White and Knox were called, she complained, and it was generally so understood and was certainly our opinion."

Mrs. Capt. Stilwell remarks: "That Drs. White and Knox were called in at her (Mrs. Dugan's) *special request*, she alleging she had been grossly neglected by Dr. Adreon, &c., &c.," her (Mrs. S.'s) mother, Mrs. Francis Burke, observes the same thing, Mrs. Polly Sly confirms the above in the following language, viz: "I know every fact in that statement (Mrs. Stilwell's) to be true, from personal knowledge." Mrs. Mary Ann Reinhimer, who lived in the same house with Mrs. Dugan, says: Mrs. Dugan complained very much of her attending physician, Dr. Adreon, said he had opened her bowels, which was the fact; Dr. Adreon left Mrs. D. after the operation, and did not return for two or three days."

Jno. G. and Barbara Myer, say: "She (Mrs. Dugan) complained of the attending physicians; saying they had ruined her; being in the same house (renting to Mrs. D.) all these facts are well known to us." Mrs. Childs states when Mrs. Dugan complained of Dr. A.'s neglect, Dr. A. replied, "D—n you, you ought to be glad to have any one."

Falsehood No. 8.—Adreon's letter, page 25, R.'s Supplement: "She (Mrs. Dugan) never acknowledged the authority by which it has been attempted to be shewn that Dr. White and Knox were called in to visit her." Mrs. Dugan's affidavit, page 65, Med. & Surg. Journal for July, Sarah Waddington, Rev. Jos. Tabor, and F. Knox, M. D., prove beyond question the above assertion utterly false. Besides this ample testimony, F. E. Robinson and Elizabeth Robinson state, "It was by her (Mrs. Dugan's) *special request* that Dr. White and Knox were called in; she alleging in our presence, that she was abandoned by her physicians; and Mr. Light told me that he ought to and would send for other physicians; as she had positively requested him to do so." Mrs. Capt. Stilwell says: "That Drs. White and Knox were called in at the *special request* of Mrs. Dugan; to my certain knowledge, it was by her *express authority* they were sent for."

Falsehood No 9.—Adreon's letter, page 25, Reyburn's Supplement: "Dr. White and associates had interfered in her case, created great alarm for her recovery, and sought to induce her to discharge me and retain them in attendance," which is confirmatory of his associate and co-reporter's statement—now the clear and distinct letter of Rev. G. C. Light is conclusive on this subject, to-wit: "To visit her (Mrs. Dugan) professionally without any prospect of fee or reward I would consider an act of humanity," on page 73 of July No. Med. & Surg. Jour.; also *vide* in same Journal, the unequivocal testimony of Rev. Jos. Tabor, Sarah Waddingham, Drs. Knox, Trudeau and Henry; and say Mrs. Stilwell, Sly and Mrs. Frances Burk, "to our certain knowledge it was

by her (Mrs. Dugan's) express "authority," Mr. Light was requested to have Drs. White and Knox to visit her and the wish of every friend she had;" also, see oath of Mrs. Dugan, July No. Med. and Surg. Journal, page 66. "I never heard a word or witnessed an act on the part of Dr. White, designed to injure my attending physicians; and was, as before remarked, unwilling in the commencement to attend me and gave up my case willingly when my physicians returned." Mary Ann Reinheimer observes: "She (Mrs. Dugan) became very ill during (that is during the abandonment) this time; sent for the minister, Rev. Mr. Light, and told him to send for his physician, Dr. White, which he did promptly. Drs. White and Knox came and took charge of the case." Barbara Myers, sister of Mrs. Reinheimer, Jno. B. Myers and his wife Barbara Myers, of whom Mrs. Dugan rented, and living in the same house, and consequently cognizant of all the facts, confirm Mrs. Reinheimer's statement.

But, aside from the conclusive testimony, what motive (for there cannot be a human action without a motive) could Dr. Knox and myself have had, in this "interference?" This attempt to have them (Adreon, &c.,) discharged and us "retained?" She was too 'poor to pay' according to their own showing: and the loathsome, disgusting and protracted character of her case forbade utterly the idea on our part of any wish to "interfere" in such a case; but when duty and humanity (deserted as we have proven her to have been, and that too in consequence of her poverty) called loudly for aid, we promptly responded; but not until we were unequivocally solicited to visit her, by her own declaration, and the Rev. G. C. Light's letter. But, independent of all this, to shew the utter effrontery and base falsehood of these men; their own report says: "That the tumor was opened on the 27th April, '40;" and I never visited or saw Mrs. Dugan in '40, after the 26th of April, yet the charge of interference is on the "29th or 30th of April."

Falsehood No. 10.—Adreon's letter, page 26 Reyburn's Supplement: I declare the statements made in the letter of Mr. and Mrs. Cox appended to Dr. White's publication to be false and malicious."

Reyburn's Supplement, page 12, Dr. R. says: "The next statements are those of Thomas and Ann Cox, which are testified to be utterly false by the affidavit of Dr. Adreon. This very man and woman, Thos. and Ann Cox, were brought to the witnesses' stand, and what evidence they did give was swept away like "chaff before the wind" by an exhibition of their *utter and degraded ignorance!*" Now falsehood is charged upon these witnesses by Dr. Adreon and Reyburn, upon no other ground than that of ignorance and poverty; they were examined in open court, and the attorney, on the part of the defence did not dare even insinuate that they were guilty of perjury; nor was a single witness adduced to controvert their testimony—*No! not one.* And by whom is it now attempted to invalidate their statements? What, the *modus operandi*? Why, by the novel mode, that could have occurred to no other than the *colossal* and *towering* genius of Dr. Reyburn, which is, as Dr. Knox has remarked, in his able and triumphant vindication, "by leaving out in his (Dr. R.'s) answer, the main individual (Dr. Adreon) charged in the indictment, and introducing him as a witness." In

other words it has been proven by the Coxes that the report of Dr. Reyburn and Adreon is incorrect, and Dr. Reyburn to meet the charge, assumes the character of advocate, and Adreon becomes the pliant witness; a mode which I would recommend to be adopted by any lawyer engaged in criminal cases, as certain to insure success for their clients and save themselves a vast deal of labor and anxiety. Then for the testimony of this modest, veritable, and *exceedingly convenient* witness of his: Dr. Reyburn has found no difficulty in proving anything by him, *even his own immaculate innocence and purity*—Herculean, as would be the task by the common rules of evidence. Mrs. Capt. Stilwell, who has all the qualifications of a witness that Dr. R. requires (intelligence and property) says: "I have read the letter of Thomas Cox and Ann Cox, his wife, in page 72 of the July No. of the Med. & Surg. Jour., and know that statement to be true in every material fact." Mrs. Frances Burk, her mother, and possessing intelligence and *property qualification* confirms to the fullest extent Mrs. Stilwell's attestation of the truth of the letter of "the degraded, ignorant" aye, and "poor Coxes," thus: "The statement of my daughter, Mrs. Capt. Stilwell, I know personally to be true." F. E. Robinson and Elizabeth Robinson say: "The facts as contained in the letters of the Coxes we know to be true in almost every particular; in every feature of any importance, at any rate, as read by us in the Medical and Surgical Journal for July, 1846." Mrs. Mary Ann Reinhimer, a very sensible and humane woman, was with her constantly, and remarks: "I have read the letters of Thomas S. Cox and Ann Cox, and have personal knowledge of the truth of their statements (with the exception of reading the letter alluded to in that statement,) and tho' I did not read the letter myself, I heard them speak of it at the time, in 1840, in such a way as left no doubt on my mind, of its existence!" Jno. G. Myers and Barbara Myers, of whom Mrs. Dugan rented the house, confirm this statement. Mrs. Polly Sly saw the letters of the Coxes and "know the facts to be true, as stated."

Thomas Dugan, being on oath before Justice Colvin, states "That Mr. and Mrs. Cox visited my mother often, and their statement is true, as given in the St. Louis Medical and Surgical Journal, July No., 1846."

Now then, it is shown by some of the most respectable men in the city, that these "poor, degraded and ignorant Coxes" are estimable, sober and truthful citizens; and, more than this, their statements are confirmed by the clear and distinct testimony of ten persons; two of these persons are members of the Presbyterian church; one, Mr. Robinson, an elder in that church, who is proven by Rev. Mr. Homes and Joshua Tucker, Esq., to be a man of high standing and veracity, and two others standing high in the Methodist church, and all five of them possessing Dr. S's. *property qualification*.

Is it possible that a man can be found in this community, who would boldly and fearlessly advocate the doctrine, that because a man is poor and ignorant, he is therefore not entitled to credit? Yea, *it is possible!* Dr. Reyburn has boldly asserted the fact; and reasoning "*a priori*," he being the Ajax Telamon (in his own estimation) of the profession, his statements then, unsupported by a single witness, are true; tho' directly in opposition to the incontestible evidence of the forty witnesses adduced. Is this, sir, your standard of veracity and respectability? Can such doctrines be tolerated in a land of religious, political and

civil freedom? Do they not shock all common sense? Can it be said, and tolerated, too, by an intelligent community, that a mere sprig of a fungus aristocracy, an *ape* of the noble and godlike aristocracy of true merit, founded upon moral and intellectual culture, and wealth acquired by industrious and meritorious deeds? I repeat, can it be said to this community by such a would-be aristocrat, that ignorance and poverty are synonymous with falsehood and crime? Hear him! "The utter and degraded ignorance" of the Coxes (page 12 of the Supplement) *entirely disqualify* them from telling the truth; and yet "degraded and ignorant" as they are, they "shrink from perjury," (what I fear, from the history of this case, it is more than you have done, with all your intelligence, and as we *would suppose* wealth.) Are degradation and ignorance then indeed identical? destitution and crime? Yea, I am forced to the confession, (reluctantly too) that there is a class of men in the world, a mock aristocracy, self-conceited, self-important, I will not say in what school, when, or where bred, but there is a class of men who are opposed in principle, and who hold in sovereign contempt, the general diffusion of knowledge, amongst the "poor and ignorant" people; and who consider the masses, not as human beings, endowed with moral, religious and intellectual culture, with noble and god-like aspirations, and important destinies to fulfil, but mere *cattle* in the field, *brutes*!! "ignorant," *therefore*, "degraded"; "poor and destitute," *therefore*, imbued with crime. But, as there is in this world a different class of beings, who can recognize in the "poor, ignorant and destitute," the exalted virtues of industry, sobriety and uncompromising veracity, I hope that these veracious and highly accomplished and most elevated gentlemen, will not take it amiss, in the old-fashioned mode of applying evidence, "time whereof, the memory of man runneth not to the contrary," to compare in point of veracity, the evidence of the Coxes with theirs; and test in the most rigid manner the truth of each. For I can tell the gentlemen a secret, which seems never to have entered their pure and unsophisticated minds, to wit: that the object in procuring evidence is to elicit truth; not to mystify it by evasive "suppositions," "informations," "beliefs," "implications" and special pleadings; that the use of language is to develop *truth*, not to conceal it, as this Medical Machiavel would have us "infer."

Then we have the direct and unequivocal declarations of Mrs. Capt. Stilwell, Mrs. Frances Burke, F. E. Robinson, Elizabeth Robinson, Mrs. Mary Ann Reinhimer, Jno. G. Myers, Barbara Myers, Mrs. Sly, and the oaths of Mrs. Dugan, Mr. Bardo and of Thomas Dugan to sustain the Coxes in their statements; besides almost every material fact in these statements is also proven by Messrs. Light & Tabor, Mrs. Waddingham and Mrs. Childs. Now, how do these gentlemen propose meeting this testimony? Not by offering proof to the contrary; not by invalidating their testimony other than by the usual mode previously alluded to; for this they *can not do*. No, it is by an easier process! by empty denial, personal and abusive epithets and invectives. You are interested parties, and your statements must be taken "*Cum grano salis*," the affidavit of the principal party, Adreon, cannot "cover" the testimony adduced; the people cannot bolt such a bolus as this, though prescribed by physicians of "superior merit" and transcendent abilities

and refinement. Then, if there is *justice* in this community, and efficacy in truth, it will at once be seen and appreciated, that the "poor, ignorant" and despised Coxes stand upon the broad and adamant platform of truth, bidding defiance to the anathemas and grossly abusive epithets of their *more favored* fellow-citizens, T. Reyburn and S. W. Adreon; and the exclusively intellectual "Sanctum Sanctorum" of this fungus aristocracy of the *would-be-rich-and-well-born*, into whose high and sacred pale, none, "poor, ignorant," or vulgar, should ever intrude, has been successfully invaded even by the Coxes; and these impious and false worshippers at its shrine, have been hurled from their unholy sacrifices; and truth, sacred truth, though clothed with the mantle of ignorance and poverty, has asserted her prerogative; and we find these "degraded" persons worshipping in their place, and they shall no longer exclaim, as they were wont to do, "stand aside, for I am holier than thou." "We never knew the man disposed to scorn the humble, who was not himself a fair object of scorn to the humblest."

Falsehood No. 11.—Adreon's letter, page 26. "This person, (supposed relation) informed me in the summer of 1843, that Mrs. Dugan had been written to by Dr. White inquiring into her state of health and urging her to return to St. Louis." Mrs. Dugan's oath, page 66, July No. of Med. and Surg. Journ. says: "In a word Dr. White never had any agency, directly or indirectly, in procuring my return to this city." Page 15, of Reyburn's Supplement, "Dr. White sent for Mrs. Dugan, and on that invitation she came more than a year afterwards." How pressing that invitation must have been. "Clairvoyant" indeed must be the mind that from such premises deduces such conclusions! But in view of the manner in which I had been assailed by Drs. Adreon and Reyburn, in 1840 and '43, in the most vulgar, disreputable and slanderous language, would it have been, on my part, a breach of professional courtesy, or at all improper to have sent for her by letter, or otherwise, in order to procure the only testimony, her presence, by which I could prove the falsity of these slanders? the breach of professional courtesy would be *theirs* and not *mine*, even under that state of fact.

Falsehood No. 12.—Adreon's letter, page 26, Reyburn's Supplement. "Dr. White instigated the late suit against Dr. Beaumont and myself," which Dr. Adreon charges upon sundry "suppositions," and as many "informations." Mrs. Dugan says, on oath, page 66, Medical and Surgical Journal for July, "Nor did he (White) at any time, by advice, or deed, have anything to do with the prosecution against Drs. Adreon and Beaumont; on the contrary, urged and advised a contrary course." Dr. Coon's letter, page 67, proves the same facts beyond question. Page 68 *ibidem*, Murdoch & Field, the attorneys on the part of the prosecution, say—"You (White) had nothing to do with employing us. We were sent for by the plaintiff, and it was through her urgent solicitation we brought the suit, and not to gratify any other person." Independent of this positive testimony, she, Mrs. Dugan, sued as a pauper, and consequently the court appointed these very men as her attorneys; therefore it is impossible that I could have "instigated the suit," as falsely charged. Now, notwithstanding this *vast* amount of testimony, irrefragable in its nature, as unalterable as the laws of the Medes and Persians, because founded upon the eternal principles of truth, yet strange, strange to tell,

one individual can be found who has had the unblushing effrontery to assert, with the full knowledge that all these facts were known to the witnesses whom I have adduced to prove the entire falsity of his letter, that, "I (Adreon) solemnly aver that what I have stated in this communication (reference here is made to his, Dr. Adreon's, letter published in Reyburn's Supplement) I know and believe to be strictly true, to all of which I would at any time be willing to be qualified." And this too, uttered in the face of all this testimony, showing the incorrectness of his "communication!!!!"

Yes, this solemn assertion is made in the face of, and in opposition to the statements (some of them on oath) of some forty witnesses of the highest respectability and veracity, and made too by one who has the sacred mantle of religion thrown *loosely* about him. We have then to draw from these facts the inevitable conclusion, that either these forty witnesses are wilful and malicious slanderers, or that S. W. Adreon has been willing to make oath to that which, under all the circumstances, he must have *known* to be absolutely and entirely false.

The respectability, and total disinterestedness of these forty witnesses, besides the fact of many of them being the near neighbors of Mrs. Dugan, having daily intercourse with her, consequently cognizant of all the facts to which they testify, utterly forbid the idea of their being slanderers, and that they could be mistaken; therefore, Stephen W. Adreon, if he has made affidavit to his letter, as stated in Reyburn's Supplement, page 10, stands before this community as a convicted perjurer. Is it not presumable that this convenient and cogent witness, Dr. Adreon, in his own behalf, knows all the visitants and attendants who met at the bedside of Mrs. Dugan? They are yet here, and it would be as easy for him to procure their testimony as myself. But this is "too tame a process" for men of such brilliant and refined minds as Drs. Adreon and Reyburn. For fear Dr. A. may have forgotten them, let me refer him to the sixteen or eighteen, whose testimony I have adduced. They include those who rented to Mrs. Dugan, who lived in the same and adjoining buildings, religious and humane persons, though some, unfortunately, "poor and ignorant," yet some are intelligent and *rich; for the rich and well-born* will sometimes visit the poor and afflicted, and as you and your compeer, Dr. R. have great regard for this class, allow me to refer to some, other than those already mentioned; but for the present I shall only name one, a lady of "wealth" and high respectability, Mrs. Nathaniel Childs, Sr., a lady, too, possessing intelligence, originally from your place, (Baltimore) and of course presumed to know your good qualities best, and who (from a *personal knowledge* of all the facts connected with the case) will do ample justice to your *head and heart*, and will answer every sentiment in your *veracious* letter, published in Dr. Reyburn's elegant, dignified and "*sarcastic*" Supplement; and, if you have spoken *truly*, my word for it, she will tell you so, over her own signature. Ask her if Mrs. Dugan was well when she left for the upper country? Ask her if Mrs. Dugan's statements, published in the St. Louis Medical and Surgical Journal, pages 64-5-6, are true, or the statements of a perjured woman? I am authorized to say that she will tell you that she was *not* cured at that time, and that Mrs. Dugan's statements are correct. Ask her if the bowel was not opened and its contents *instantly* discharged by the orifice made by your lancet: or if

there was, as you state, a discharge of "well-digested pus?" The first she will answer in the affirmative and the latter in the negative, as stated distinctly by Dr. Beaumont to Dr. Trudeau, viz: "That the bowel was opened by Dr. A's. lancet, as sworn to by him, (Dr. T.) but suppressed by Dr. Reyburn, in giving the history of the trial, as recently stated to me by Dr. T. himself. Interrogate her on every, the most minute statements in your letter, and, if you *dare*, publish her response. Ask her if she did not tell you, before you operated, that Mrs. Dugan had hernia, and that there was nothing in *that hernial tumor* except the bowels and their contents; and if you opened it that death would be the probable consequence. Ask her if Mrs. Dugan was "cured" in July, and whether you did not *know*, when she left for up the river, that the opening in her side was as bad as it ever had been; she will answer you affirmatively.

Falsehood No. 13.—Dr. Reyburn's Supplement, page 2. That his history of Mrs. Dugan's case "was made out from notes taken in the earliest part of the disease," therefore his report of her case is correct, and mine unworthy of credit.

Now it is obvious from Dr. Reyburn's report itself, page 555, that he did not see the case till the middle of June. Dr. Knox and myself saw the case on the 25th of April, as proven by Mr. Light's letter, page 93, July No. Saint Louis Medical and Surgical Journal, near two months prior to Dr. R's. first visit; yet this exceedingly *accurate reporter* had a better chance of observing Mrs. Dugan's symptoms than ourselves; and, although two months later than us, and only a month previous to her departure, was enabled to take "notes of her disease in its earliest period!!" the entire accuracy of which may well be questioned when we find in the very beginning of them an *important and gross blunder* in reference to dates, viz: page 546, he represents Dr. Adreon as opening the abscess on the 27th April, when we visited the patient on the 25th, which was some three days after the operation; and Dr. R., on the same page, 546, represents the "*diseased parts as nearly healed,*" on his first visit. Under these circumstances, I would most respectfully ask Dr. R. how he was enabled to take notes of the disease "in its earliest period." By a clairvoyant operation, I presume, retrospective clairvoyance, a new branch of that interesting science!! But Dr. Sykes, the main consulting and co-attending physician, emphatically denies that *any* notes of the case were ever taken by either Reyburn, Adreon, Beaumont, or himself, during its progress.

Falsehood No. 14.—Dr. Reyburn's Supplement, page 10. "It has never been asserted by any one that Drs. White and Knox ever had the case till 1844." Independent of the ample testimony adduced under "Falsehood No. 8," I will show from Dr. Reyburn's own statements the falsity of this allegation. Though ordinarily very bad authority, it will, according to the best authorities upon evidence, be admissible against himself. Page 16, of his Supplement, he says, "Mrs. Dugan seemed as gratified at their (Knox and White) defeat and *ejection from the case* as Dr. Adreon possibly could have been." Now it is difficult to conceive how we could be "ejected from a case," yet never having been in that case; but Dr. R. can readily comprehend this or anything else that may suit his purpose for the time-being. Pity, pity, that you had so soon forgotten on the 16th page what you had written on the 10th, but it veri-

fies the old axiom "that a liar should have a good memory." Yet in the very teeth of all this and even his own testimony, he has the impudence to assert, page 10 Supplement, "Now, here is falsehood proven on Dr. White, for it never has been asserted by any one that Drs. White and Knox ever had the case until 1844: therefore the 'coarse epithet' of falsehood recoils upon the head of this 'Prince of liars.'"

Falsehood No. 15.—Dr. Reyburn's Supplement, page 9. Dr. Adreon deposes that "he never absented himself from the patient any such length of time as two days."

Although I have proven conclusively that Dr. Adreon did abandon the case for two days, by the testimony of Mrs. Dugan, Mrs. Waddingham, Rev. George C. Light and Rev. Mr. Tabor, yet I will adduce such further proof of this fact as will satisfy the most skeptical of the recklessness exhibited by these gentlemen in denying the most palpable facts. Mrs. Capt. Stilwell remarks—"As soon as Dr. Adreon opened the intestine, he left and did not return for three days, during this time Drs. White and Knox were called in." Mrs. Frances Burke confirms this statement. Mrs. Sly confirms the above statements thus—"I know every fact in that statement (Mrs. Stilwell's) to be true, from personal knowledge." F. E. Robinson and Elizabeth Robinson say—"She (Mrs. Dugan) alleged in my presence, that she was abandoned by her physician." Mary Ann Reinhimer says—"Dr. Adreon left Mrs. Dugan after the operation, and did not return for two or three days. She became very ill during this time, and sent for Dr. White, through the Rev. Mr. Light." Jno. G. Myers and Barbara Myers confirm the above statement thus—"The attending physician, after the operation, left her for two or three days, and other physicians were sent for."

From this testimony, it is distinctly proven that Dr. Adreon *did* abandon the case for at least two days, and in my remarks on "Falsehood 14," I have proven that it was during this abandonment, that myself and Dr. Knox were called in, and took charge of the case. What credence, then, can be given to the statements of men who hesitate not to deny facts of so glaring a character, but who thought, perhaps, in the lapse of time that has passed (six years) that these things would be forgotten, and therefore no proof could be had of their mendacity.

Falsehood No. 16.—Dr. Reyburn's Supplement, page 10. "Now I take occasion to remark, that it was never my intention to include Drs. Henry and Trudeau in the charge of 'volunteer Doctors,' nor do I believe the idea was ever presented, until the letter of Dr. White to them published in his recent article." Now this statement is shown to be utterly false by the fact, that Dr. Adreon demanded a personal explanation in reference to this very matter of Drs. Henry and Trudeau, in a short time after this visit to Mrs. Dugan, in 1840; and I well recollect on that memorable occasion, that the gentleman thought it *prudent* to pass me by—a prudence which it would have been judicious for him to have exercised over his "cacœthes carpendi, loquendi et scribendi;" but like all other Sir Forcible Feebles, the physical has more terror for him than the moral punishment; but as Dr. Knox has so fully exposed this falsehood, I will quote him, page 12: "When Dr. Adreon speaks of 'White and associates,' I would like to know if he does not mean to reflect upon Drs. Henry or Trudeau, for *how many* he takes me? It is in proof that only those gentlemen, Dr. White and myself visited the case.

Really I feel almost compensated for having failed to secure Dr. Reyburn's good opinion, by so high a compliment from one who uses him as his supple tool. But, seriously, this only shows that course to have been an afterthought; (and so many *afterthoughts* appear in this remarkable document that it should rather have been entitled Retrospective Review, than 'Supplement,' or anything else,) and the same appears from the fact that Dr. Beaumont hurls his charges indiscriminately against a whole bevy of us. He doubtless had not been informed of the change in the plan of attack; and why, if they saw cause to withdraw their charges as against a part of those accused, why, not, like honest men, withdraw them as to the rest? True, Drs. Henry and Trudeau were fully proved clear of all the charges that had been made; but the very same evidence that proved them clear, just in the same degree and to the same extent, proved all the charges false as to every person against whom they were directed!" But as Dr. Reyburn is good authority, at *least with himself* as well as against himself, I will quote him, page 554 of his Report, he says, in reference to the voluntary "deputation of Doctors"—"Its a 'hernia,' says one—'the Doctor has cut a gut,' was the refined expression of another—'take a dose of castor oil,' says a third," etc. Now, here are three persons at least, consequently others than Dr. Knox and myself must have been referred to, and as Trudeau and Henry were the only other physicians who visited Mrs. Dugan at that time, one, nay both of them must have been alluded to, consequently it was an afterthought of these gentlemen to leave out Drs. Henry and Trudeau.

Falsehood No. 17.—"Mrs. D's. affidavit sets forth that her disease was and still is hernia; an assertion positively contradicted by medical witnesses." Now this affidavit of Mrs. Dugan's has *not* been contradicted by a single medical witness, save two of the clique, as adduced in the Supplement, Carpenter and Brown. The former entertained the idea for a while that it was hernia, but as he says in his examination before the court, changed his mind, from information received, and examination. Now Dr. C. says, page 558, May No., "that he saw the plaintiff, (Mrs. Dugan) once in the summer of 1840. There was a large sloughing ulcer in the groin half as large as the hand." From this condition of the parts, how accurate must have been the Doctor's deductions!!! What implicit confidence must be placed in his statements! How extensive and important must have been the pathological changes, judging from his description of the disease when he saw her; and the other, B. B. Brown, Dentist, whose "position in regard to the medical profession is of such a delicate character as to forbid" his testimony having much weight with the intelligent portion of the medical community. Quere: Most learned surgeon of the dental profession, did you hear Mrs. Dugan's disease called "tuphlo enteritis" by any one during the interview of 1840, alluded to by you? and did you, at that time, know that such a disease as tuphlo enteritis existed? Dr. Reyburn thinks it utterly impossible for Mrs. Dugan to note and recollect for six years the minute points of a disease under which she has been laboring for thirteen years, yet a Surgeon Dentist, entirely unacquainted with the history of the disease (a disease in fact of which he had never known or heard at that date) is competent, after one short interview, to recollect, after six years have elapsed, the details of symptoms, the report of which occupies

eleven pages of the St. Louis Medical and Surgical Journal; and if, as Dr. Brown says, "Mrs. D. did evince some knowledge of surgical technicalities," the public will certainly acknowledge that, for an exceedingly modest man, he has evinced a most extraordinary memory; and probably from the interest he has manifested in the case, has received the benefit of those "lectures," about which so much has been said by Drs. Reyburn and Chase. O shade of Hippocrates!! has it come to this, that a Surgeon Dentist, (I mean no disrespect to the profession of a Surgeon Dentist) though he says "he practices the higher branches of his profession," is to step forth as the Magnus Apollo of the medical profession, and say to Drs. Knox, Muldowney and McCabe, graduates of Philadelphia, stand aside and let my six years' recollection of an intricate surgical disease, refute your testimony. "Sic transit gloria mundi."

Falsehood No. 18.—Page 3, Reyburn's Supplement. "Dr. Carpenter was convinced by her own statement that her disease was not hernia."

I have previously referred to the state of Mrs. D., as described by him when he saw her, "that there was a large sloughing ulcer in the groin half as large as the hand." Dr. C. saw the patient but once, and this was her condition. Dr. R. may have the *benefit* of this testimony. Quere: Was it at the *memorable confession scene* that this change of opinion occurred?

Falsehood No. 19.—Reyburn's Supplement, page 3. "The present statement of her disease is not the history given by her to Drs. Beaumont and Adreon."

Page 64, July No. St. Louis Medical and Surgical Journal, is recorded the oath of Mrs. Dugan, that the present statement of her case is the same as that given in 1840, to Drs. Beaumont and Adreon. It is certainly the same that she gave Dr. Knox and myself, and Drs. McCabe and Muldowney, with twelve other witnesses bear perfectly in mind that she had hernia in 1840, from their observation and her description of symptoms at that time; Dr. McCabe having remarked most emphatically to Drs. Perry, Simmons, Pallen and others, that it was hernia, and dissection would prove it. It was certainly her interest to have given us a correct history of her disease, in 1840, as we had to treat her case accordingly; and it is passing strange that she should have given a different history of her symptoms to Drs. Beaumont and Adreon, a very short time previous to our visit, as there could not be any motive for her to practice deception.

Falsehood No. 20.—Reyburn's Supplement, page 6. "To all these questions, (referring to the existence of hernia) her replies were in the negative."

Such and so (using language perfectly unintelligible to the patient, page 6, Supplement) were not your symptoms, were they Mrs. Dugan? Oh, no, Doctor! This is the *a la animal magnetism mode* of putting questions and obtaining the negative answers. The programme of questions having been duly arranged beforehand, these gentlemen had no difficulty in recollecting the interesting, and, to the defendants in this suit, important mesmeric scene which took place on that occasion; and, with them, it mattered not whether the witnesses were learned in the surgical lore—the unmeaning jargon of hernia and tumphlo enteritis, or whether tumphlo enteritis only existed in the mind's eye. A whitewashing operation was to be effected, and the shortest and most effectual way

was to obtain a *confession*; and for this purpose, it was not thought advisable to require Dr. McDowel's "viginti lucubrationes" in studying these diseases. Oh, no, a dentist, (one of the clique) who practices the higher branches of his profession is q. s.

No. That she did not give Drs. Beaumont and Adreon the same history of her symptoms, which is proven she gave to some eighteen or twenty others, about the same time, is opposed to reason, common-sense and obvious facts.

Falsehood No. 21.—Page 7, Supplement. "Dr. Mullooney, at the time referred to, was Dr. White's office student, and not a graduate in medicine, until April, 1841." By reference to page 387 of *Dunglison's American Medical Intelligencer*, under the head of "Graduates of the Jefferson Medical College, 1840," a contradiction to this wilful perversion of truth will be found recorded. Dr. Mullooney *was* a graduate of that noble school of medicine, and my partner, in 1840. Yet this reckless libeller, in order to lessen the force of Dr. Mullooney's testimony, says he did not graduate till 1841, and was my office student, in April, 1840.

Falsehood No. 22.—Page 7, Supplement. "Dr. Mullooney sees the necessity of accounting for singular phenomena, which he evidently did not understand, and states accordingly, that 'the climate, exciting causes, or some local phenomena had made a great difference in the disease, as it is described by authors, or else some blunder exists in his ideas of the disease, or in the case cited.'" Now it is evident to the impartial reader that Dr. Mullooney understood Mrs. Dugan's disease to be hernia, and that the language quoted by Dr. Reyburn was ironically used, to express the fact, that, to him and in his section of the country, such symptoms as those of Mrs. Dugan's would be considered as indicating hernia; but that probably the superior intelligence of St. Louis physicians, aided by "climate, exciting causes," &c. &c. could mystify and change a common, old-fashioned case of hernia, into what Dr. Mullooney sarcastically denominates "*Missouri Tuphlo Enteritis*," and Dr. Reyburn understood very well what Dr. Mullooney meant; but, like all his special pleadings, he thought it best to assume ignorance; hence he could not comprehend Dr. Mullooney's *sarcasm* better than other people can his own.

Falsehood No. 23.—Page 7, Supplement. "Dr. White contradicting plaintiff, and Mrs. Bardo contradicting both." You forgot, (and most conveniently, too,) to show how and when this contradiction took place. Most veritable Doctor, the community will not take the assertion of a convicted slanderer on dictation.

Oh no! oh no! Doctor of superior merit, pardon me if I should call for proof of one who has already been convicted of twenty-two falsehoods; proof! proof!! *documents* are the order of the day; not round and bold assertions, "suppositions," "implications," from sundry "informations," &cs. No, no, they wont do. The bolus cannot be swallowed by a rational and thinking community. There is yet justice in the world, and truth still winds its energy. To use a quotation which you have much abused, "Truth is mighty, and will prevail."

Falsehood No. 24.—Page 7, Supplement. "Among all the physicians examined on the trial, not one corroborated any of the witnesses for the prosecution." Now Dr. Knox and myself corroborated the statement

of all the witnesses who considered Mrs. Dugan's disease hernia. Drs. McCabe and Mallowney, who were not examined, corroborated this view, in that respect, and it is a little remarkable that out of the sixteen physicians examined on the part of the plaintiff, not one, no, not one said it was *not* hernia, or that it was "Tuphlo Enteritis;" but Dr. Nash McDowel mentioned to Drs. Perry, Tiffin, Col. Field, myself and others, before and after the trial, that it was an obvious case of hernia. Such, too, was the declaration to me of almost every other physician who visited her with me in 1844; and if they had been permitted by the court to have expressed their opinions, founded upon Mrs. Dugan's history of her symptoms in conjunction with their observations of her disease in 1844, they would have testified it to be hernia.

Falsehood No. 25—Page 8, Supplement. "So firmly established in the minds of the profession and the public generally that the trial originated in the most unjustifiable malignancy, &c."

This veracious author must consider himself the very embodiment of the "profession and the public generally," for really I have not been made acquainted with this important fact until this *wiseacre* gave us the information. However, he will be pardoned for this little mistake, as he generally looks through a jaundiced medium, and in this instance means the *little public*, the *would-be-profession*, the *clique*; and so far as the secret whisperings, inuendoes and malignant falsehoods of this miserable nucleus extend, circulated in the most untiring and industrious manner, just that far the statement is true. Public opinion is omnipotent, and the ultimate arbiter of all matters of this sort; and to it I yield a willing assent; though for a time its current may be changed from its legitimate channel by black and malignant falsehood, it will ultimately resume its wonted course. Conscious of a course of rectitude, I fear not its dictates. Facts, and not mere empty words are requisite, most erudite author of the Supplement, to whom the following lines seem justly to apply:

"In trifling show, his talent lies.
And form, the want of intellect supplies;
Hourly his learned impertinence affords
A barren superfluity of words."

Falsehood No. 26.—Page 8, Supplement. "Mrs. Dugan's affidavit bears its falsehood on its face." Forsooth, says this veracious Doctor, "She is totally illiterate, and of the lowest grade of intellect." What a Sequitur!! What a holy horror this very personification of truth has of ignorance. Pity, pity, he does not entertain a similar feeling towards falsehood: he might have saved himself much of the withering scorn and indignation of the honest public, and me much trouble in exposing his gross obliquities.

"This Mrs. Dugan," says Dr. R., page 8, Supplement, "is of the lowest grade of intellect, and totally illiterate and degraded." Yet in his report in the May No. of the St. Louis Medical and Surgical Journal, 1846, he remarks—"That the patient's delicacy was extreme, is shown by the fact, that even when asked, she did not acknowledge the existence of any tumor of the abdomen."

Oh, what a refined creature this poor illiterate and degraded being of 1846 was in 1843. You should, most veritable Doctor, have had a good memory. It is important to a man who intends his "random shots pro-

perly appropriated:" or you should have had your report, alias *sarcasm*, before you, when you penned the Supplement, for "Truth alone could give sharpness to the sarcasm—fact alone could give edge to the censure." You recollect the Coxes for the same reason, could not tell the truth. Oh!! what a terrible crime to be poor and ignorant—depravity a necessary consequence; is it true that wealth and distinction are the only characteristics of moral worth? and true merit has not its reward?

Falsehood No. 27.—Page 8, Supplement. "The complaint that the report of the trial was garbled and incorrect, was founded on one or two trivial errors." This Dr. R. knew to be entirely false when he penned it. Drs. J. N. McDowel, J. B. Johnson, the two Drs. Stephens, Drs. Trudeau, Knox, Wm. C. Lane and many others were grossly misrepresented, as I have understood from them personally, and almost every other medical man examined. It will be recollected, I was represented in that report, as stating on oath, that I was *not* the physician of Mrs. Dugan, on her return to this city. And it is well known, that upon the very ground of being her physician upon her return here, and inviting physicians to visit the case, that I was charged with gross violation of professional courtesy by this very Dr. R. and associates; yet two or three months elapsed, after the publication of that gross and wilful perversion of my testimony, and no correction was proposed until I had procured, and was in the act of publishing the correction. Can it be believed that he did not read, and with peculiar gusto, this favorite bantling of his, immediately after its birth, as thirteen pages of the report were comprised in his own testimony, while the testimony of the nineteen other witnesses occupy only thirteen and a half pages, although the examination of some of them occupied a longer time than his own.

Yes, he read it, and must have seen the errors, whether typographical or not, but it suited his purpose better, to convey the idea that I was discourteous enough to invite physicians to visit a case not my own.

Dr. R., I presume, was the only man that was pleased with the report. He had a special eye to self-aggrandizement and laudation, but I think it more than probable, he acquired a notoriety in that way, that will not be quite as compatible with his feelings, as when he delivered it in court.

Falsehood No. 28.—Page 8, Supplement. "Letter of A. P. Field, to which Carpenter's letter will afford a full reply." Carpenter's "impression," monstrous!!

Falsehood No. 29.—Page 8, Supplement. "And that of F. B. Murdock, which properly belongs to Dr. McPheeters. I was not present at the examination of Dr. W." Neither was Dr. McP., as he himself states, and as he was also prohibited, by a rule of court. Quere: Then, Doctor, how did you learn the *lie*, that I was prompting the witnesses, lawyers, &c. &c.? but of this more anon.

Let us have done with this letter business. Field and Murdock state, page 68, July No. St. Louis Medical and Surgical Journal, "You (White) had nothing to do with employing us." Now, to prove these statements incorrect, and such men as Field and Murdock had not stated the truth, a letter from one C. J. Carpenter is introduced.

(Reyburn's Supplement, page 29.)

DR. REYBURN:

Dear Sir—In answer to your note of the 1st ult., the conversation you refer to, between Mr. B. F. Murdock and myself, Dr. Sykes being present, was this: "I inquired of Mr. M. why the long-talked-of suit was not commenced: he replied, that they (Murdock and Field) could not, or would not proceed in the suit until Dr. White, who was absent in the North, returned, as the facts and information upon which they expected to prove mal-practice, they would obtain from him." This, sir, produced the impression in my mind, as I *presume* it has in many others, that Dr. White was the principal instigator to this quite notorious suit for mal-practice.

Respectfully,

C. J. CARPENTER.

The following letter from Mr. F. B. Murdock, will remove, possibly, Dr. C's. "impression," upon which he bases a serious charge against my reputation; and I will here remark, that though every man who testified against me, in the Supplement, are and have been my enemies, for six to eight years, and not on speaking terms with any one of them except Dr. Chase, still they can't get beyond an "impression," and *they* seem to be quite easily made. Quere: If Carpenter had not been an avowed enemy and one of the clique, would that "impression" have been made, or would not an honorable enemy be very cautious in receiving "impressions" derogatory to one's character? But Mr. Murdock is a gentleman, of the legal profession, high-minded, honorable, and disinterested. What is his reply to Dr. C's. "impression?"

Sir—Having left St. Louis on a visit to Pennsylvania, on the 29th of August last, the letter of Dr. C. J. Carpenter, of the 6th August, 1846, published in the Supplement to the July No. of the St. Louis Medical and Surgical Journal, did not come under my notice until this day. I have only to say in reply to it, that I remember well the conversation alluded to by Dr. Carpenter; but he has mistaken the facts; he did not inquire of me "Why the long-talked-of suit was not commenced," for it had already been brought months before, and this he knew, for it was a subject of general interest among the medical profession. In the conversation Dr. Carpenter seemed to desire that I should say that the suit was brought at the instance of others, not of the plaintiff, Mary Dugan; and he spoke of Dr. White. I denied this emphatically, as far as my knowledge extended, stating, however, that I knew but little about the case, as Col. Field was the chief counsel, and knew more about the facts than I did. He asked then if the case would be "tried at the then approaching term," and I told him I supposed it would be, if Dr. White returned in time from his trip to the North; for I had heard Col. F. say that he was one of the attending physicians, and that he was an important witness.

F. B. MURDOCK.

October 31, 1846.

How does it happen that Dr. Carpenter, with whom I do not speak, and one of the principal witnesses on the part of the defence, is seeking an interview with the plaintiff's attorney and strongly desiring Mr. M. to implicate me, and with all his desire and perversion of facts, as shewn above, he, even he, whose eagerness to injure me, had induced him to write two letters for his worthy Doctor *Munchausen*, and seems only to

have reached the elevation of the Doctor himself, an "impression!" Now is it not amusing that these pinks of medical ethics, should, upon mere "impression," "supposition," "implication," &c., &c., set forth grave charges against a brother of the profession, that if, true, would forever injure him in the eyes of all honorable men? and every step in this matter shews that with them, "The end sanctifies the means."

The following maxim will well apply to this clique; "Soepe, intereunt aliis meditantes necem."

Falsehood No. 30.—Page 8, Supplement. "The letters of Mr. Tabor, Mrs. Waddingham and Mr. Light will be covered fully by the affidavit of Dr. Adreon." "Aye, covered, he would cover anything, no doubt.

Falsehood No. 31.—"The letter of Dr. Knox is refuted by that of Dr. Henry, as I will show." How did he show it? Why by uttering a wilful falsehood, viz: "That Mary Dugan's case was never in charge of Dr. Knox and myself." See proof to the contrary above. Consummate impudence!!

Falsehood No. 32.—Page 10, Supplement. "It is evident that none of the parties here quoted, considered the patient Dr. White's case, and that Dr. White himself did not, for he administered no relief."

Now this assertion bears upon its face impudent, unblushing and unequivocal falsehood, and Dr. R. knew it, when he gave utterance to the slander. I certainly should not have visited this woman otherwise. It would be absurd, perfectly preposterous; and what proof does this most profound reasoner adduce to show that I did not consider the case mine? Why, "that I had afforded the patient no relief," and you cannot "have a case" without affording that case relief!!! Then I am sure it was not Dr. Adreon's case, for she has not yet been relieved, and never will be till she return to her mother earth. No, never. Go visit her, gentlemen, she is just above the water-works, and any relief that either your humanity, generosity or skill may afford her, will be most gratefully acknowledged by her, I am sure, and myself as well, for I can only palliate, but you of "superior merit," may cure her.

Falsehood No. 33.—"Dr. Knox." He isn't hurt badly.

Falsehood No. 34.—Page 10, Supplement. "Mr. Light apologised." The Rev. George C. Light apologised!! and to whom? Stephen W. Adreon!!! for branding him, justly too, with gross ignorance and neglect, in the discharge of his professional duties. No, it is untrue. Mr. Light, the very night of the interview alluded to by Dr. Adreon, assured me, at my office, that the result of that interview only confirmed him in the opinion, that it was a case of hernia, and had been most unskillfully and improperly managed, and that Dr. Ventriculus, alias Wm. Beaumont, had completely failed in absolving the attending physician from the aforesaid charges.*

Falsehood No. 35.—Page 11, Supplement. "Now it does not appear that any of the physicians requested to see the patient by Dr. White were ever asked to minister to her relief." I obtained the opinion, with the view to her relief, of almost every physician who visited her, as Drs. McDowel, Carr Lane, J. S. Moore and others will attest. Quere:

* Since the body of this article was written, I have received a letter from Rev. Mr. Light, for which, see Appendix.

Were yourself, Surgeon Dentist Brown, and Dr. Carpenter invited by Dr. Adreon in 1840, (at the memorable confession scene) to administer relief to the patient? at a time, too, when, according to that report of yours, she was "almost cured." Inter nos—I don't mean to be inquisitive.

Falsehood No. 36.—"All that Dr. White complains of, as being remarked of his conduct, was observed prior to the case falling into his hands, (1844.)" Now, this impudent fellow, who seems to *lie* constitutionally, habitually and by education, knows full well that Dr. Knox and myself were called to, and took charge of this case, as I have proven by Dr. Reyburn himself, and some six or eight witnesses of the highest respectability, in April, 1840. (See Mr. Light's note, &c.)

Falsehood No. 37.—Page 11, Supplement. "Dr. Simmons, invited by both Drs. Knox and White." (See Dr. Knox's vindication, page 17.) Dr. Knox has in his possession a letter from Dr. Simmons, proving this statement utterly untrue, as regards himself, and though invited by me to visit the case, and properly, too, as Dr. Knox remarks, he readily acceded to my invitation, and would have gone the next morning, as proposed, but for the fact of learning that the attending physicians had returned to take charge of the case, and did not, as this slanderer states, "indignantly spurn," what he terms, "such equivocal conduct."

Falsehood No. 38.—Page 11, Supplement. "Whilst on this subject, I will remark that the tone of Dr. J. B. Johnson's letter is, I think, (to use an expressive term) rather cavalier, and savors of a wish to have as little as possible to do with the person addressed. I would further observe, that this must have been noticed by Dr. White, for it is the *only* letter which he does not publish as an entire production."

In my article, July No. of St. Louis Medical and Surgical Journal, page 67, it will be seen that Dr. Mallowney's letter is *marked as an extract*; D. N. Hall's letter, on the same page, is also marked as an extract; the former marked thus, "The above is an extract from a letter of S. Mallowney, M. D.;" the latter thus, "Extract of a letter from D. N. Hall, an Attorney at Law." Yet Dr. R. says "Dr. Johnson's is the only letter which is not published as an entire production."

But he goes on, "Extract of a letter this date, insinuating (i. e. White) of course, that more was written by Dr. Johnson, and yet I am informed, that every line written to Dr. White by Dr. Johnson is published in the extract." I have Dr. Johnson's letter before me, of which there are twelve lines besides the caption and complimentary conclusion, from which I made an extract, page 72, July No. St. Louis Medical and Surgical Journal, of less than four of these lines. Any gentleman can see it by calling at my office. Now, are we to attribute such base and wilful falsehoods, as proven in almost every line, to gross ignorance and recklessness of character, or to infamous knavery and an indomitable thirst for *lying*? Let him choose his horn of the dilemma—upon one or the other he must hang—aye, be held up to the withering scorn, indignation and contempt of every man in the community, who has any, the slightest regard for truth and justice. Whenever he has a lie to pen, he finds it convenient to be "informed" on the subject, yet never introduces his informant. At other times, we have "belief," "suppositions" and "impressions" and "implications" drawn therefrom. But Dr. Johnson's letter is *not* "cavalier." But were it otherwise, what

has that to do with the point at issue between Dr. R. and myself. It is a *ruse de guerre* to divert the mind from the true issue.

Falsehood No. 40.—Page 11, Supplement. "It was for the show of numbers and names that this and other letters were obtained."

Dr. R., not content with uttering a falsehood to each paragraph, we trace three separate and distinct untruths in this one; two of which I have just shown by documents, and by reference to the extracts from Dr. Johnson's letter. My conduct is clearly proven to be "professional and gentlemanly." Joining issue with the gentleman on these points, I leave my readers to judge for themselves. With a short quotation from the letter of Drs. Wm. Carr Lane, John L. Moore, A. G. Coons, John Shore, R. P. Chase and C. W. Stevens, who say, (St. Louis Medical and Surgical Journal, page 71, July No.) "In the instance of Mrs. Mary Dugan, whom we visited at your request, there was no room to doubt the perfect propriety of our visit, as this case had been published to the world, and a virtual invitation had been given to the profession to go and examine the case for themselves."

"To invite medical men to visit extraordinary cases is not only customary but praiseworthy," yet these extracts merely exhibit an empty show of "names and numbers."

It will be distinctly recollected, though, that this very man, Reyburn, and his compeer, Adreon, have charged me directly with "inveigling" these very witnesses, indicating and directing the course of interrogation, and when I prove this charge a wanton falsehood, oh, they reply, "The letter of Dr. Carr Lane and others, only shows an abstract point of courtesy, by which I (Reyburn) was permitted to visit the case." And their mention is only a display of "numbers and names." Now, if Drs. J. B. Johnson, Lane, Coons, Moore, Shore, &c., &c., speak truly that my course was professional and gentlemanly, in inviting them to see the case, and then in investigating it, your charge of "inveigling, extorting letters from them by deception, putting leading questions and directing the answers," is false, and you knew it at the time of the concocting of your evasion of their testimony, and I challenge the proof of your charge. No, you have no proof; your lecture on courtesy and reform is a cathartic which you recommend to others, but will not take yourself. 'Tis the cure of a supposed pimple on the face of the "body medical" by superinducing a "sphacelus" in the entire system.

In order to lessen the force of Dr. Johnson's testimony he endeavors to produce the impression that his letter was "cavalier," but if this letter was "cavalier," the letter signed by Wm. Carr Lane and six others is also, as it refers to the same point of Dr. J's. letter; but, the Doctor in this is not sincere, and intended it as one of his "sarcasms," to which he refers and points out as his own, on page 14, Supplement, twice, page 16 thrice, page 18 twice. Common people would take them merely as very stupid falsehoods, had he not referred to them and defined their character. He also refers to more "sarcasms," and speaks of them in his controversy with Dr. Foregeaud. I readily admit with Dr. R. that "truth alone gives sharpness to sarcasm;" and by this rule your sarcasms would be harmless indeed, most refined knight of the lancet.

Falsehoods No. 41 and 42.—Page 15, Supplement. "Dr. White's

conduct in court evinced an interest that forbade an impartial course on the witness stand. The question as to the original length of the paper was asked by the counsel for the plaintiff, to whom Dr. White acted as prompter during the trial." These are falsehoods, than which, there could not exist any more base and gratuitous. First, Dr. Reyburn was not present at my examination before the court, as he himself distinctly states, page 8, Supplement, consequently could have had no personal knowledge of the fact. Second, he adduces no authority whatever upon which to ground the charge; but to place this matter beyond question, I will adduce the following proof of the impartiality of my conduct, as a witness, and the utter recklessness of this slanderer.

St. Louis, October 28, 1845.

Dear Sir—I have received your note of the 27th instant; and in answer to your inquiries—I was foreman of the jury in the case (Mrs. Dugan's) alluded to by you, and state that I saw nothing to warrant the belief, on my part, of any undue excitement, or want of impartiality in your testimony, or did I notice you in the court-room but twice, once on the witness stand; the second, in calling the attention of Mr. Polk in reference to your testimony; neither did I at any time observe your prompting either lawyer or witness.

Yours, respectfully,

Signed:

C. P. JAMES.

To Dr. Thomas J. White.

I was deputy clerk of the St. Louis County Court, attending in court at the time of the trial of the case of Mary Dugan versus Drs. Beaumont and Adreon, and concur entirely in the annexed (above) statement of Mr. C. P. James. By order of the court, made at the request of counsel, the witnesses in the cause were ordered to retire from the court-room, while other witnesses were giving their testimony, which order was strictly complied with. I state further, that according to my best judgment, Dr. White appeared in the trial only and solely in the character of witness, and his testimony was given in the character of a Doctor of Medicine, called to testify upon a subject connected with his profession, and was certainly free from any excitement, and I should also say partiality, in my judgment, founded upon what I saw at the trial.

Signed:

HENRY A. CLOVER.

St. Louis, October 31, 1846.

For the same facts I am permitted to refer to Mr. M. Cerre, juror in the case, and known to almost every one in the city; indeed I confidently appeal to judge, jury, lawyers and by-standers for the same truth.

"I was deputy sheriff at the time, and very often in court during the progress of the trial of Mary Dugan versus Beaumont and Adreon, and did not see Dr. White in the Court House at all, save during his examination, and witnessed no excitement, prompting witnesses or attorney, &c., &c.

"Signed

HENRY B. BELT."

In reference to the same E. W. Decker, deputy sheriff, remarks, that "I, acting as deputy sheriff at that time in said court, did, in obedience to an order of court, cause the medical witnesses in the case to retire to

another room in the Court House during their examination, and I did not observe your exhibiting an extraordinary interest in this cause, as far as my recollection goes."

"In reply to your note desiring me to state if, in the late trial of Mrs. Dugan's case, you acted as prompter to the attorneys or witnesses of the plaintiff, or manifested a degree of interest that "forbade an impartial course on the witness stand." As the principal counsel of the plaintiff, I can state that you neither prompted or made suggestions to me, nor did anything of the kind pass under my observation in your intercourse with others. So far from manifesting an interest to compromise your impartiality as a witness, I was compelled to employ the process of an attachment to procure your attendance; nor was I able during the trial to see you, so as to acquire from you that information which I desired in relation to the medical particulars of the case, and which, as the medical attendant of Mrs. Dugan, I knew you must possess.

"Very respectfully, yours,

A. P. FIELD."

To Dr. T. J. White.

"I concur in the statements of the foregoing letter of A. P. Field.
F. B. MURDOCK."

D. N. Hall, Attorney, says—"Col. Field's letter is in conformity to my observation of your course and demeanor on the trial of Mrs. Dugan's case."

But had all this been true, the profession and community would have justified (under the circumstances) the course, and I am very sure the result of the trial would have been different, as three or four of the jurors have distinctly stated to me, since the publication of my first article. Indeed, one of the jurors, publicly announced the fact during his attendance on one of Professor McDowel's late lectures upon Hernia; the Professor at the same time expressing his clear conviction that such was the nature of Mrs. Dugan's disease.

But, in reference to this matter, as a specimen of Dr. R's. logic, he says the following "reasons leave my agency in the suit without the shadow of a doubt:"

First. "My hostility to Beaumont and Adreon." Then, indeed, hostility to one is proof positive of dishonorable conduct and motive!

Second. "The fact of Dr. Beaumont being included in the suit." A very strong reason, truly, and quite sufficient, upon which Dr. R. would found a grave charge.

Third. Mrs. Dugan's ignorance proves that "a woman of her judgment and knowledge could not calculate the chance of damages." Ergo, Dr. White instigated the suit against Beaumont and Adreon!!!

Fourth. "Dr. Adreon had seen some one in the street, who informed him that Dr. White had written to Mrs. Dugan and urging her to come down." She came more than a year after this; a pressing invitation, truly!!

Fifth. "Dr. White's immediate attendance on the case." Most convincing and conclusive proof this!!!

Sixth. Dr. Carpenter's letter, proving that "I acted as amateur informer," which is amply "covered" by reference to Mr. Murdock's reply thereto; in which Dr. C. is shown to be an "amateur inveigler."

Falsehood No. 43.—Page 15, Supplement. “But I need no further proof than the assertion (made during the trial) of a member of one of our first legal firms, that Dr. White had called on them, and urged them to take the suit, which they declined; anticipating (to use the gentlemen’s words) that it would turn out as it has, a dirty piece of business.” This is a most wilful, deliberate and malicious falsehood; and, as usual with Dr. R., his informant (very conveniently for him) “is absent from the city.” Now, I deny, most emphatically, that I have ever “called on and urged” any firm or lawyer, here, or elsewhere, in my own proper person or as agent for Mrs. Dugan, “to take the suit.” And I undertake to say that no lawyer in the city of St. Louis, has so little regard for truth, or is willing to prostitute his profession to so base and malignant a purpose. No, the legal profession has never been disgraced by such a pettifogger, as has that of medicine, in the person of T. Reyburn. I challenge the proof, and defy this reckless, wholesale and retail slanderer to produce a statement of that purport, over the signature of any reputable lawyer in the city. Be sure, good Doctor, and not be “informed” of the fact, nor appeal to the dead, or the absent; and until this is done, you will stand branded before this community as an infamous libeller, and all honest men will consign you to the only society that befits you—that of yourself.

Falsehood No. 44.—“A faithful and accurate report of the trial.” (Supplement, page 17.) Now it is an obvious fact, that there is scarcely a single physician, if one, who has not complained of the *garbled* and *inaccurate* report of their testimony in that case; and it has not escaped the faculty, or any careful reader of that report, that Dr. Reyburn, the reporter, is the only witness whose testimony was given in full; and it will be observed that he stands forth in bold relief as a *star* of the first magnitude in its luminous and *faithful* pages.

Falsehood No. 45.—Page 22, Supplement. “Extra copies of the offensive No. of the Journal, which were indecently hawked and sold in the street as the private speculation of my venal assailant.”

The mind cannot well conceive of an object so abject, mean, groveling and loathsome, as to make this charge against any one, without the most positive and unequivocal proof of the fact. Yet Dr. Reyburn, upon a mere, “it is presumable” prefers a grave charge, against a brother practitioner, as disgraceful and contemptible, as the infamous liar, who would consent to pen such a slander upon a groundless presumption. Self-respect alone should have caused an honorable mind to have recoiled at the idea; but the remorse of a guilty conscience, and the desperate writhings of a reckless libeller swallow up all self-respect, in the maelstrom of their own infamy. The following document will show how little credit is to be placed in this “coarse, indecent and calumnious writer.”

St. Louis, Mo., October 14, 1846.

DR. WHITE:

Sir—Dr. Reyburn never had any authority from me to term his pamphlet, containing a reply to your remarks, “A Supplement to the St. Louis Medical and Surgical Journal.” As to what I got for extra numbers of the July No., I would say that you paid me for twenty-five numbers;

Nafish, Cornish & Co. paid me for fifty numbers, and I have Messrs. Eberlein & Shultz charged with thirty copies.

Very respectfully,

Signed :

W. P. PENN,

Publisher Medical and Surgical Journal.

Now that I have ever sold, for "private speculation," or otherwise, a single number of the St. Louis Medical and Surgical Journal, is totally untrue, and I challenge the proof of my "venal assailant" and his associates, who have for years past, been hawking about the streets and alleys of the city, by "mysterious whisperings," such unfounded and malignant slanders as the above against the private and professional reputation of a brother practitioner; and it may be here asked with *emphasis*, what should be the "current impression of the morale" of my medical assailants, from the proofs already adduced?

Falsehood No. 46.—Page 8, Supplement. "One physician of eminence, (Dr. McCabe, is alluded to) in this city, to, whom he (Dr. White) addressed a letter on some point in his article, actually, I am informed, returned the epistle without any reply or notice of any kind, and after this cool mark of contempt, Dr. White used his name on the authority of another, though prohibited doing so by his informant."

This exceedingly scrupulous and most veracious Doctor has been most unfortunate in his "informations," as the following letter and remarks will show, to wit:

"As Dr. White was a friend of mine, I delivered the letter alluded to myself, and am prepared to say that the statement of Dr. Reyburn is incorrect. Dr. McCabe politely and gentlemanly remarked to me 'that he had kept out of this difficulty thus far, and he would have nothing to do with it on either side,' and offered no disrespect to Dr. White.

"Signed :

A. P. KELSO."

Now, as Dr. McCabe had publicly, and without the injunction of secrecy, expressed his opinion of the nature of Mrs. Dugan's disease, in 1840, '43 and '46, to Drs. Perry, Pallen, Simmons and others, there was no breach of confidence on the part of any one. But, for the fact of Dr. Pallen's injunction of secrecy in regard to myself. Dr. Pallen voluntarily informed me, soon after Mrs. Dugan's return to St. Louis, ('44) that Dr. McCabe said to him, whilst Dr. Reyburn's report was being read before the Medical Society, (his name being announced in that report, as one who had visited the patient at the request of Dr. Adreon) "that he differed with Dr. Adreon and associates in reference to the character of her disease; that, in his opinion, it was hernia." Just after the trial, Dr. Pallen and myself had another conversation about the matter. He reiterated the same facts. Then, I asked Dr. P. if, as Dr. McCabe and myself were not on speaking terms, there would be any impropriety in mentioning the fact on his authority. He replied in the negative, remarking that possibly Dr. McCabe would not recollect his statement. Will you then, see Dr. McCabe on the subject? I asked. His reply was in the affirmative. Thus the matter stood until I showed Dr. Pallen the last proof sheet of my article. Dr. P. read it and voluntarily remarked that he had seen and conversed with Dr. McCabe, and he reiterated what he had said on a former occasion, "That it was a

case of hernia, and that dissection would prove it;" whereupon I left him; he not uttering a word in reference to secrecy! The conclusion followed from our previous conversation, inevitably, that I was permitted to use the information given me—the only condition suggested to me having been removed. But the same fact could have been asserted on other, and as good authority; why, then, a disposition on my part to violate any confidence reposed in me? But this entire matter is irrelevant. It is one of the many small means of this *skulking pimp* to direct the attention of the reader from the true issues. "Revenons a nos moutons."

Falsehood No. 47.—Page 26, Supplement. Adreon's letter—"I am confident these gentlemen (Drs. Henry and Trudeau) condemn the course pursued by White as strongly as any other members of the medical profession." The following letter and authorized statement place the above base falsehood upon these "indecent and coarse" calumniators, beyond question.

DR. T. J. WHITE:

Dear Sir—Since your reply, published in the St. Louis Medical and Surgical Journal, I have not spoken to Dr. Reyburn on the subject, (my course in Mrs. Dugan's case is referred to.) I believe when the character of a gentleman is assailed, he is justifiable in repelling the attack. The respectability of the testimony and the willingness with which it was given clearly show an *approval of your course*.

With respect, &c.

J. HENRY.

September 22d, 1846.

I am also authorized by Dr. Trudeau to say that the above statement (in falsehood 47) was totally unauthorized by him, and *untrue*—made in presence of Charles Gratiot, Dr. W. S. White and Thomas White.

Falsehoods No. 48 and 49.—Page 20, Supplement. "Dr. White's articles, I understood were offered to the Missouri Medical and Surgical Journal, and declined for two reasons. First. That it would place the Journal in a hostile position to the St. Louis Medical and Surgical Journal; and Secondly, That the style would kill any Journal that would publish it."

The following letter from the editor of the "Missouri Medical and Surgical Journal" will speak for itself, and is an effectual antidote to these falsehoods.

St. Louis, October, 21, 1846.

DR. T. J. WHITE:

Dear Sir—In answer to your note of the 16th instant, requesting me to give my reasons for not publishing in the Missouri Medical and Surgical Journal your article in reply to one which appeared in the May No. of the St. Louis Medical and Surgical Journal, over the signature of "McP." I would state, as I did to you in person—First, That the paper was of too great length for so limited a journal. Secondly, I felt that it was due to the readers of our Journal to publish nothing in it but what I deemed of practical importance, and thirdly, I was unwilling to assume a hostile attitude towards a rival journal. You offered me

but one article for publication, and I have no recollection of having ever made *any other* remark in relation to it, than that its language was strong and its sarcasm severe.

Yours, with much respect,

THOMAS BARBOUR.

Falsehood No 50.—Page 1, Supplement. "Some of these (White's) witnesses are sought from the lowest walks of degradation and poverty, where famishing want opens a willing hand for the assassin's pay."

Now, I would ask this "assassin" of character, to which of the following long list of witnesses adduced in my first article, does he allude in the above chaste and elegant article, to wit:

A. J. Coons, M. D., Mary Dugan, S. D. Mullowney, M. D., D. N. Hall, Jno. M. Krum, A. P. Field, F. B. Murdock, Joseph Tabor, Sarah Waddingham, F. Knox, M. D., L. Henry, M. D., J. M. J. Trudeau, M. D., Wm. Carr Lane, M. D., Jno. S. Moore, M. D., John Shore, M. D., Robert P. Chase, M. D., Charles W. Stevens, M. D., W. M. McPheeters, M. D., J. B. Johnson, M. D., Thomas S. Cox, Ann Cox, Rev. George C. Light, David Bardo, M. M. Pallen, M. D., C. T. Stith, M. D. ? Now, these are all the witnesses that I have adduced in my former article; and, of these, the Coxes and Mrs. Dugan are the only witnesses to whom he has made any objection; and that based alone upon his assertion of their "poverty and ignorance." Yet, notwithstanding their "poverty, ignorance and degradation," I have shown, in the previous part of this article, their statements to be true, by some eighteen or twenty witnesses, and their characters endorsed by some of the first citizens of our city; but, with Dr. Reyburn, to be poor, is to be bereft of every virtue; and, probably, as applied to himself, it is true; for, in judging of others, the Doctor may have made himself the standard. In reference to this indigent and "ruined" object (Mrs. Dugan) of controversy, I would remark—"Res est sacra miser." Yes, there is a hallowed respect due to the wretched, which should protect them from insult, or further depression. To be poor and ignorant is bad enough, but, in consequence of that alone, to be insulted by the imputation of being controlled by the "assassin's pay," and that too by an "Anguis in herba," winding his tortuous course along the fence side, seeking, from his skulking position, an opportunity of inserting his envenomed fangs into the unwary passer-by, is an outrage too intolerable for endurance! As has been remarked by a distinguished friend of mine, of Kentucky, "We must not disguise the fact, that there is a line of demarkation drawn by the proud and arrogant between themselves and those who live by the sweat of their brow; between the comparatively idle, who live but to consume, and the industrious, who work but to produce; between the drones of the hive and the laboring bees. The mechanics (of which this man Cox, is one) compose the motive power and labor-working machine upon whose industry we all feed and fatten. Their labors are the wealth of the country; and, when we cease to honor and enrich them, we poison the spring of our own invigorating prosperity, and cut off the sources of our own enjoyments." Who would not rather be this humble mechanic, though poor and comparatively ignorant, than his self-elated slanderer?

"The purest treasure mortal times afford,
Is spotless reputation. That away,
Man is but gilded loam."

But, notwithstanding Dr. Reyburn's onslaught upon these witnesses, not one particle of evidence has been adduced to invalidate their testimony, or upon which to build the slightest imputation whatever, that they could be controlled by the assassin's pay ; but, on the contrary, how are we to account for the new-born zeal of this ingenious advocate of Dr. Adreon ? Did he not denounce this same man, S. W. Adreon, only a few months since, as the basest of his species ? (and I will not contest this point with him.) Was this not the fact even up to the trial ? and on his examination, did he not swear, page 558, May No. St. Louis Medical and Surgical Journal, that Dr. Adreon and himself " were not on speaking terms ? " How, therefore, does it happen, that immediately after the trial and the appearance of my article, these gentlemen became good and mutual friends, each endorsing the other's character ? We read of a similar instance in the holy scriptures : " And the same day Pilate and Herod were made friends together ; for before they were at enmity between themselves. "

The object seems to have been to concoct an answer to my article, which could not well have been done separately, as then their details might have conflicted ; since there did not exist that " unalterable and reliable note-book, " as has been stated by one of the attending physicians in the case, (Dr. S.) and for the gallant manner in which Dr. Reyburn came to his rescue, Dr. Adreon, by virtue of his place as Alderman, furnished his new friend and advocate a recommendation to the Mayor of the city, by which he received the appointment of consulting physician to the City Hospital, as I have been informed by the Mayor himself. But it was not the " assassin's pay " that induced this friendly act on the part of Dr. Reyburn's new friend. Oh, no ! oh, no ! The sacred pale of the *rich* and *well-born*, cannot be invaded by the " assassin's pay. " How beautiful is chemical affinity ! by which particles distant and dissimilar are made to unite in one homogeneous mass, and assume a unity of form and a similarity of nature ! The physical laws of nature are truly wonderful, and the mind too ; aye, immortal mind, by some such equally wonderful process, only known to the initiated, furnishes us occasionally instances of such an homogeneous and symmetrical union of faculties totally different and at war with each other. Now, that I have had some agency in bringing about this new and wonderful combination, and this most extraordinary play of affinities, almost as strange a phenomenon as the *remarkable cure* of Mary Dugan, I hope these gentlemen will give me credit for bringing about this desirable result, at least.†

Falsehood No. 51.—Page 7, Supplement. " My assertion, on the authority of Dr. Adreon, that Mary Dugan was cured when she left St. Louis, which is denied by Dr. White, is confirmed by one of Dr. White's own witnesses, Mrs. Waddingham, who informed Dr. Beaumont that Mrs. Dugan told her (Mrs. W.) that her side was perfectly healed for six months after she left St. Louis. "

I have never made such a statement to Dr. Beaumont, or any one

† It is well known to the faculty, that Dr. Adreon denounced Dr. Beaumont as a hypocrite, nay anything but a gentleman, a few months since, and will, of course, be surprised to see that gentleman's high-wrought *encomium*, in his late production, on this self-same Beaumont—another instance of that beautiful play of affinities !

else, as that referred to me on page 7 of Dr. Reyburn's Supplement, as above quoted.

SARAH WADDINGHAM.

November 24th, 1846.

The above contradiction was made in the presence of her husband, Mr. Waddingham, one of our most wealthy and respectable citizens, who heard the only conversation had by Dr. B. with Mrs. W. Some time previous to the late trial Dr. B. made a special call on Mrs. W. to elicit testimony for the contemplated trial, and Mr. W. declares most emphatically that no such admission was made by Mrs. W.

Then it is true, aye, true, that this *pink of dignity*, this very paragon of innocence, Dr. B., did make a special visit to a witness to control or direct the testimony of said witness. Again, he has uttered to Dr. R. a most wilful and deliberate falsehood in reference to that contradiction, or Dr. R. has openly misrepresented him.

I will now proceed to redeem my pledge in the former part of this article, to prove by irrefutable record evidence, that Dr. Reyburn has been guilty of *false-swearing* in the trial of M. Dugan versus Adreon and Beaumont.

First. Dr. Reyburn, page 548, May No. St. Louis Medical and Surgical Journal, testifies on oath, that "I would think there could be no possibility of a hernia below an artificial anus;" and on same page Dr. R. describes an artificial anus thus: "Artificial anus is an artificial opening through which fæcal matter passes out." Again, on page 546, *ibid.*, Dr. R. acknowledges the existence of an artificial anus, in these words, viz: "All that then (June, 1840) remained was a small fistulous canal about the size of a quill, communicating internally with the intestines, and opening externally on the abdomen."

Now, I will show by testimony, that this Doctor has not attempted to refute the position that femoral hernia does exist, and has existed in this case, below an artificial anus; but it was deemed necessary by the gentlemen to discredit the testimony of others, and, therefore, the extraordinary fact is proclaimed to the medical faculty and community, that "There could be no possibility of hernia below an artificial anus." Whether this assertion is the result of moral obliquity, or a most disgraceful want of medical knowledge, the faculty and community, from the history of these matters, will form their own opinion. In the July No. St. Louis Medical and Surgical Journal, page 93, Doctor A. J. Coons, "I am decidedly of opinion that the most unequivocal symptoms of femoral hernia, then (1844) existed in connexion with artificial anus."

On the same page of this journal, we find the unqualified assertion of Drs. Pallen, Stith and Pollok, that femoral hernia existed when they saw her, July, 1846.—"Of which opinion," says Dr. Reyburn, "I am happy to avail myself. It is an additional circumstance in favor of the views advanced in the paper on taphlo enteritis, read before the court."

"The appearance of femoral hernia is corroborative of the existence of taphlo enteritis, for the cicatrization necessarily taking place in the abdominal integuments, after the disorganizing process of that disease, would materially retract Poupart's ligament, and by thus enlarging the crural arch, give greater facility to the formation of femoral hernia. This surgical opinion cannot, I believe, be controverted."

Thus it appears by the above admission and reasoning of Dr. R. that his oath was not only incorrect, but that he knew it.

Dr. Jno. S. Moore, May No. of Journal, page 543, states on oath—"There was an artificial anus in the Iliac region, above Poupart's ligament then (1844) discharging." Ann Cox, page 531, on oath, says—"Saw plaintiff's side, last summer, (1845] still running, discharging the same as it was when witness first saw it," (1840.) Dr. Wm. Carr Lane, 541, on oath, states—"Saw plaintiff (Mrs. Dugan) in summer of '44. There was a fistulous opening in the right groin, from which bilious matter oozed; witness thinks orifice was above Poupart's ligament, in the location of hernia." Dr. F. Knox, page 534, states on oath, "Plaintiff had hernia last time witness saw her, below Poupart's ligament. The patient was laboring under artificial anus." Dr. Edwards and Dr. Stirman observed both artificial anus and hernia, a few days since, in the same patient. In view of these facts, can a hernia exist below an artificial anus? What say you, my medical brethren? Do you not feel yourselves much obliged to this erudite Doctor for his most wonderful discovery of the fact, "That there could be no possibility of a hernia below an artificial anus?"

Secondly. Dr. R. testifies on oath, 547, same Journal, that "Perforation existed before any opening was made." Now, Dr. R., by his own report and evidence, proves that it was utterly impossible for him to know this fact, (even had it been true.) Page 546, Dr. R. states, "abscess formed, and on the 27th April, * * * * * he (Dr. A.) then opened this abscess." Again, page 555, "The narrator (Dr. R.) saw this case in the middle of the month of June."

Now, it is clear, from Dr. R.'s own statement, (which indeed he does not pretend to deny,) that the opening was made on the 27th of April, and he first saw the patient in the middle of June; and yet, Dr. Reyburn swears positively, (for hearsay evidence would have been excluded,) that "Perforation existed, before any opening was made." In other words, he swears to the existence of a fact, that must have occurred some six weeks before he ever saw the patient! Wonderful!! wonderful!!! The Dr.'s retrospective vision is remarkable indeed. But, aside from the monstrous absurdity of the thing (to use no harsher term) as shown by *his own testimony* against himself, I will now prove most positively that there was no opening ("or perforation") before that made by Dr. Adreon's lancet. Sarah Waddingham (page 532) says: "I saw her side before the operation; there was then no opening in it." I am authorised, by Mrs. Nath'l. Childs, Sr., to say distinctly, that there was no "perforation" in Mrs. Dugan's side, until that made by Doctor Adreon, which was made into the bowels. See also the oath of Mrs. Dugan, pp. 64 and 66, July No. Med. & Surg. Journal.

Thirdly.—Page 558, Dr. R. says: "Am under the impression that she (Mrs. D.) left without his (Dr. Adreon's knowledge or approval." F. E. Robinson and Elizabeth Robinson state: "It was with the advice, knowledge, and consent of Dr. Adreon she (Mrs. Dugan) left." Elizabeth Stilwell states: "It was with the knowledge and consent of Dr. Adreon that, Mrs. Dugan left (St. Louis in 1840) as he (Dr. A.) himself told me." Mary Ann Reinheimer and father state: "It was by the advice and with the full knowledge of Dr. A., that Mrs. Dugan left for the upper country, in 1840." I might mention others, but the witnesses I have here adduced are sufficient. But in all these instances, Dr. Reyburn has sworn to facts, of which he could

not possibly have had *personal knowledge*. Yet, in these oaths, has not quoted others, for *that* would have been *hearsay evidence*, and therefore excluded; no, Dr. R. had made a report in 1843, to gratify the *malice* of others and his own *inflated vanity*; and, rather than acknowledge his errors, "went the whole hog," *swore to it*: he has thus, from an overweening self-conceit of his "sarcastic" power of composition, obtained for himself *notoriety and reputation*, that no honest and honorable man will ever envy him.

In conclusion, I propose examining the letters appended to Dr. Reyburn's Supplement; and, in reference to the first—Dr. Adreon's *modest, and exceedingly truthful epistle*, which he offers as the "*due contradiction*," to the points which I have established, by forty odd witnesses; and which was designed as an absolution for his *gross errors and professional blunders*. I have only to remark that the "*due contradiction*" has been fully given in the former part of this article, viewing him *not* only as witness in the case, but "*particeps criminis*" and co-defendant in the suit.

The next in order is the beautiful specimen of Rhetoric, from the pen of Dr. Beaumont, which is as *remarkable* for its *dignified, chaste and grammatical* construction, as it is for the *gross falsehoods* which it contains, as endorser for Dr. Reyburn and Adreon. This *peculiarly malignant, envenomed dotard* remarks, that the report of Dr. Reyburn, (which I have shown to be utterly false in every particular,) "was perfectly correct and candid;"—though this very report he repudiated in open court, and by motion of his attorney, it was excluded as evidence in the case of Mary Dugan *vs.* Beaumont and Adreon, so far as Beaumont was concerned. If then, it "was perfectly correct and candid," as an honest man, he could not have objected to its use against himself, in evidence; but now that he can subserve a most malignant and malicious spirit, against one, who never even mentioned his name, in connection with the case, disrespectfully, or as *particeps criminis* in the comedy of blunders, he becomes its endorser. This reckless and wilful libeller goes on to say, "That your (Dr. R.'s) comments and remarks in said report upon the characters, conduct, dispositions and motives of those to whom you have justly, though offensively alluded, are strictly correct and particularly merited." How far this is true, I leave my readers to judge from the full exposition I have already given of the falsehoods contained in that report, which Dr. Sykes himself pronounces grossly incorrect in almost every particular, as he told Dr. R—then and subsequently. Dr. B. says that he considered her (Mrs. D.) "case at the time (1840) to be "tuphlo enteritis." Now, that this statement is false, I will prove by the testimony of Dr. Sykes, one of the principal attending physicians in the following language, as used by him, in repeated conversations, to-wit: "That neither Beaumont, Adreon, or Reyburn, considered Mrs. Dugan's case one of tuphlo enteritis, in 1840; nor was the case treated as such; and that neither of those gentlemen, to his certain knowledge, ever made a single note of the case during its progress, or at any other time previous to 1843. Nay, even Adreon asserts the same fact, and Dr. McCabe has observed the same thing, from which it is evident that "tuphlo enteritis" was an afterthought, on the part of these gentlemen. In that letter Dr. Beaumont says: "Drs. White, Trudeau, Knox, Light, Tabor, &c., obtru-

ded themselves on Dr. Adreon's patient," (Mrs. Dugan.) The above statement, individually, and collectively, I have shewn, in the previous part of this article, to be without the slightest foundation in fact, as well as every other charge in Dr. Beaumont's letter; aye, beyond the shadow of a doubt, if justice has not abandoned her citadel and truth lost its efficacy. The time has gone by when we are called upon "*jurare verba magistri*." This community will not, whatever may be the fancied elevation of any person, upon his mere dictum, doom to infamy or disgrace, any man, or set of men, though it were the decree of the vatican or of an autocrat, or a no less personage in his own estimation, than a *Beaumont*.

But I will now enquire upon what grounds this man presumes to doom to destruction and disgrace Lawyers, Doctors, and *Ministers*, with one fell swoop, without the slightest, the least shadow of evidence or personal knowledge, but, in the face of all evidence. Is it from the high stand of moral or professional excellence, which he has arrogated to himself, that he presumes to pronounce upon a man's "honor and veracity," and the extent of his professional weight and character? For one to charge so able and estimable a man as the Rev. Geo. C. Light, in the discharge, too, of his high and noble calling as "obtruding" himself, &c., &c., without alleging one particle of evidence, or the shadow of a reason would be, of itself, sufficient for us to suspect both his ability and honesty. But *Wm. Beaumont*, whose brow has been "branded in letters of living light as a base calumniator," without even a contradiction, to speak of one's honor and veracity; a man who has been proven by this article as the endorser of a series of the most gratuitous, wilful and malicious falsehoods ever recorded, and of which the sacred altar of our profession and the judicial archives are polluted, by the record of the fact; a man who has been publicly tried for perjury, and who escaped merited punishment alone by the clemency of the jury; a man who has been proven guilty of falsehood and dishonesty by six or eight physicians now on record, in the judicial tribunals of our country, as will more fully appear in a few months. (See Hamilton's report, which will show him liable for the very amount out of which the suit for perjury grew.)

But in reference to this gentleman's professional ability and reputation, which entitle him thus to judge of others. Because I dared to question his professional ability, when called on to testify in court, upon his treatment of Davis, (in the case of the *State vs. Wm. P. Darnes*,) this man has become my most inveterate enemy. The cases of Davis and Hoffman are yet fresh in the minds of the community, and Banquo-like will appear to his disturbed imagination as long as his seared conscience is susceptible of the slightest impression.

He could not or would not cure the *hole* in the stomach of the poor *Canadian*, and finding that he had an opportunity of experimenting and getting some little *capital*, which neither his ability, acquirement, industry, or scholarship would command, he procures the services of my old preceptors, Dr. Robley Dunglison and Professor Emmett, (and to them he allowed the examination only so far as it would subserve his purpose; otherwise, much more valuable and important information might have been obtained in physiological science,

see George Combe's tour in the United States, page 187: "Professor Dunglison, in allusion to Dr. Beaumont's experiments on Alexis St. Martin's digestive powers, mentioned, that he had suggested and also performed the experiments at Washington, which are recorded in Dr. Beaumont's work,") to perform upon this *Canadian* a series of experiments, the credit of which he assigns to himself in a book, the literary portion of which is almost as remarkable a phenomenon, as his letter published in Reyburn's Supplement of "Sarcasms."

But, for the professional accomplishments and extraordinary surgical achievements, derived from the authorship of this book of experiments. This man, Alex. St. Martin, receives a gunshot wound, the ball entering the stomach; Dr. B. fails, by neglect or a want of surgical skill, to heal the wound; a fistulous opening (the Dr. is partial to fistulous openings) is established, whereby he is enabled to confirm certain physiological truths; which Gmelin and Tiedemann had previously ascertained. That the wound of this Canadian might have subserved the cause of medical science, in other and abler hands, I do not doubt; but Dr. B. was like the dog in the manger; he was incompetent to make the proper experiments himself, by which important physiological facts might have been established, and would not give it up entirely, to those who were qualified; lest the opportunity of acquiring a fictitious reputation might be lost to him; so that the few experiments permitted to be made by Dunglison and Emmett were all the benefits derived from this case; for Dr. B. being uneducated and totally ignorant of the science of chemistry, (and not even a graduate in medicine,) was utterly incompetent to make the necessary experiments, to develop and substantiate the beautiful science of the physiology of digestion. But by reference to the 14th vol. of the American Medical Journal, (the very highest authority in America,) his claim to a *niche* in "Fame's proud Temple," has not been sustained by the "*viginti lucubrationes*;"—"a *humble niche* in the Temple of Fame." It will be humble indeed, or none at all; and if obtained, it will be through a "*sewer*, if there be one." In the Journal alluded to, we find the following:

"He (Beaumont) has not, it is true, made any important discovery," &c., &c., "After a very careful and repeated perusal of the work, we have been not a little disappointed in finding that so much is left, in regard to the process of digestion, still uninvestigated." "The Doctor is also, unfortunately, devoid of that proficiency in the details of practical chemistry, which is all important in conducting experimental investigations into the action of the gastric juice, and into the process of digestion generally." "All we regret is, that the peculiar advantages possessed by Dr. Beaumont for studying the process of digestion, had not fallen to the lot of some one better qualified, in certain respects, for deriving from them all the advantages to physiology, they were so well calculated to afford." "And here we may suggest to Dr. B., that he can claim no credit whatever for the opportunity he possessed, for pursuing the course of experiments detailed in the work before us; but only so far as he has improved that opportunity for the advancement of knowledge."

Berzelius, one of the ablest chemists the world has ever produced, to whom some of the gastric juice of the very case was sent by Prof.

Silliman, for analysis, says, (pp. 444-45.) in his "Yearly Narrative of the advancement of Physics and Chemistry," 31st of March, 1835.

"Beaumont discovered nothing more than what was known, previous to the publication of his "experiments," in consequence of his entire ignorance of chemical experience. It was not to be expected that a man of such limited chemical knowledge could have ascertained more of what might and ought to have been discovered, if even an ordinary chemist had been favored with such an opportunity for research in that branch of science."

Now, I ask a candid public, what right, morally or professionally, has this man, as though "*ex cathedra*," to pronounce upon the merits or demerits of professional men? What are his claims to the character of an honest, candid, or truthful man; when we find him, not only endorsing, but uttering falsehoods, knowing them to be such at the time.

Beaumont to impute to one, a want of medical courtesy—a *man*, who does not know, or has never practiced towards his medical brothers the mere ordinary courtesies of a gentleman—a *man*, who would claim of a brother practitioner, instead of the patient, consultation fees. *A man!* who, when requested to see a few patients for a professional contemporary, (who was very ill,) would charge his patient more than five fold an ordinary fee, and put the money in his own pocket—that these are facts I am ready to prove.

In what light then must all honest men view the brutum fulmen of this man, who has thus voluntarily thrust himself into this controversy?

Quere: Great Ajax—did you some six or eight years ago operate, for abscess in the liver, in the presence of Drs. Call, Clarke, &c., &c., in the St. Louis Hospital, and instead of "well digested pus," did the contents of the stomach appear, with the wine given to sustain the "sinking condition of the patient?" If so, did he live long enough for a fistulous opening to form for experiments? Enquire of Professor McDowell, cum multis aliis.

"This woman had evidently read, or heard lectures on hernia, as she seemed quite learned on the subject, more so than patients usually are."

Signed,

ROBERT P. CHASE.

I addressed D. Chase a letter enquiring if he intended to charge me with having read lectures to Mrs. D.;—his reply was in the most positive manner in the negative.

Lastly, the letter of Wm. M. McPheeters: "The bold (amusingly bold) and fearless editor." His position excites my risible faculties more than any thing else; at one time, disclaiming responsibility, at another time, he assumes all the pompousness and self-conceit of a would-be hero. I have proven all the charges and insinuations alleged against me to be utterly false; Dr. Wm. McPheeters can, therefore, assume just as much of the honor and responsibility of having given utterance to falsehoods as he likes. I do not, nor does any honorable man in the community, envy him his peculiar position. "A ship may be well equipped, both as to sails, and as to guns but if she be destitute of *ballast* and of *rudder*, she can neither fight with effect, nor *fly* with adroitness."

But it is proven that Dr. McP.'s first attack upon me was based upon the *gross falsehoods* of Beaumont, Adreon and Reyburn; and I have *satisfactory evidence*, from various sources, that his recent

letter, appended to Reyburn's supplement, also originated from similar falsehoods. And as I have fully exposed *these falsehoods*, as an honorable man he will at once make the *amende*; otherwise he can share the fate of their originators and propagators.

APPENDIX.

In conclusion, I offer to the public the letter of the Rev. G. C. Light, who was the stationed minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, in St. Louis, 1840, of which Mary Dugan was a highly respectable member as he states. A man alike remarkable for his intellect, disinterestedness and piety. A man whose zeal and achievements in the cause of christianity are completely identified with the history of the west. It "covers" the entire case.

HYDESBERG, Ralls county, Mo., Nov. 3, 1846.

Doctor T. J. White—DEAR SIR: Your favor of the 7th of August was not received for some weeks after its date, owing to my absence from home; and, since my return, such were my engagements, that I could not give the subject that particular attention, which its importance seems to merit, till the present time. I have carefully and attentively examined the "St. Louis Medical and Surgical Journal," containing your "vindication," &c., and also the "Supplement to the July No.," containing the response of Doctor Thomas Reyburn and others.

On viewing the whole matter, after a lapse of more than six years, since the unfortunate occurrence, in the case of Mrs. Dugan, took place, I have, to a considerable extent, been able to refresh my memory on the subject. I see from the *date of my note to you* and *Dr. Knox*, that it was on the 25th day of April, 1840, that the request was made, that yourself and Doctor Knox should "professionally" visit Mrs. Dugan, in her perilous condition; this will enable me to speak with considerable accuracy as to dates.

About the 22d or 23d, I was called, as pastor of the Methodist E. Church in St. Louis, to visit a woman, in a suffering condition, near the Mound; I did so, in my ministerial capacity, and found her destitute of almost every *temporal* comfort, only as her wants were met by the charity of the adjacent neighbors, being surrounded with three or four children, and nothing to meet their wants, was well calculated to move the sympathies, not only of a minister, for one of his charge, but of any man possessing the common feelings of humanity. This was the reason why I presented her case to the benevolent society of St. Louis, which I am happy to state very opportunely administered to her wants, through the agency of the Rev. Joseph Tabor, who occasionally visited her with me, and whose statements as contained in your "vindication," are to the best of my recollection, and as far as the circumstances came under my notice, true to the very letter.

At the time I first visited Mrs. Dugan, I did not know who was her attending physician; neither did I know what was the nature of her complaint, till she began her tale of woe, stating that an incision had been made in her side, or above her groin, and that one of her bowels had been cut; this led me to make the inquiry as to who was her at-

tending physician; she answered Dr. Adreon, and that Dr. Beaumont had also visited her; but that neither of them had been to see her for *three days*, and expressed a belief that they did not intend returning. After making special inquiry as to the nature of her case, I was satisfied it was one that required immediate and constant attention; under these circumstances, I directed my attention to you, as my family physician, and to Dr. Knox, with whom I had become acquainted, and addressed you the joint note published in the Journal. To this you kindly and humanely attended, without any prospect of fee or reward. Little did I think, when I wrote my note to you, or when you performed the act of humanity, in visiting the suffering, (and as I then thought) forsaken woman, that our well-meant endeavors were to be made the grounds of censure and calumny. Conscious innocence and integrity fear no weapon that can be formed, and every tongue that rises in judgment shall be utterly condemned; this is the heritage of those who fearlessly do their duty, under all circumstances, regardless of consequences. On one occasion I was present when the opening or puncture was examined, when every inquiry was made as to the nature of the case. I then believed it to be hernia, and believe it still; notwithstanding all the *theorizing* that has been used, to get out of a difficulty and to cover a retreat, after defeat. If any dependence is to be placed in the doctrines contained in the books, from the days of Hunter down to the present, I must believe it to be Hernia, and nothing else; and all would have thought much more favorably of those concerned, if there had been an honest acknowledgment of the mistake, and a plea of purity of intention. But, how hard it is for some men to pronounce the following three monosyllables: *I Was Wrong*. If this had been done, the mishap would have been considered as the result of frailty, and all would have been ready to adopt the adage: "To err, is human; to forgive, Divine."

But this appears to have been too humiliating in the present case, and the innocent must suffer crimination, that error may receive the sanction of a Medical Journal; or, at least, be the organ of vindicating—what shall I say?—the unfortunate operators in this case, and of rolling censure on those who were charitably engaged in relieving suffering humanity.

But, it may here be asked, "did, or did not, Dr. Adreon, Beaumont, and the late William Smith call on you? Dr. Adreon states, at 26th page of the Supplement to the July No., I called upon the Rev. Mr. Light shortly after his interference in the case, for the purpose of explanation. Mr. Light expressed himself satisfied that my opinions, treatment and conduct were correct, and that he had been in error." This certainly places the interview we had, in an improper light. Sometime after Dr. Adreon had returned to his *patient*, (Mrs. Dugan) and the rumor of mal-practice was rife in the community, Dr. Adreon and Beaumont, and the late William Smith visited me, at my house, the (parsonage) and made several inquiries as to the various rumors afloat, and the part I had taken in the affair. I gave them an unvarnished statement of the whole, as far as it came under my notice. They then proceeded to give their version of the case; stating their reasons for not believing it to be Hernia, that it was ulceration of the bowel—in a word, anything but hernia. Not wishing to enter into

controversy with the gentlemen, in my own house, on so delicate a subject, on which they appeared quite sensitive, and not wishing to make myself a party in the unhappy controversy; I remarked, "If your view of the case be correct, we, of course, must be mistaken in our views. I did not acknowledge myself "in error," neither did I "apologize for my conduct."

The above statement is correct to the best of my recollection, and I am the more confirmed in its truth from the consideration, that I have never, from the commencement of my acquaintance with the case, had but one opinion respecting its character. I have carefully noticed that part of Mrs. Dugan's statements pertaining to the circumstances of 1840, and they are substantially what she then stated to me. During my acquaintance with her I considered her statements to be worthy of credit, neither have my sentiments changed by any and all the uncharitable remarks of Dr. Reyburn, impeaching her veracity. In turning my attention to the statement of Dr. Adreon, I was not a little astonished, especially as it is presented nearly in the form of an oath.

1st. He says, "the history of the disease given in Mrs. Dugan's affidavit was never to my knowledge admitted in 1840." I can only say the statement contained in her affidavit, so far as the affair of 1840 is concerned, is substantially the same as then detailed to me by herself, and out of this grew the visit and interview had with Drs. Adreon and Beaumont at my house.

2d. Dr. Adreon further states, "I supplied her wants." When I first visited her, she was destitute of the common comforts of life; only as they were furnished by her neighbors, and out of this grew my application for her relief, to the Benevolent Society. Mr. Tabor, the almoner of that Society, can tell how her wants were afterwards supplied.

3d. He further states: "I did not neglect her as she avers, nor did she ever express any dissatisfaction or want of confidence towards me, while treating her case." Whether Dr. Adreon ever neglected her as she avers, or not, I cannot say; but, one thing I do know: she *did complain* of being neglected, and of not having been visited for three days by Dr. Adreon; and expressed her belief he would not return; and out of this grew the invitation to Drs. White and Knox to attend her.

4th. He further remarks, "She never acknowledged the authority by which it has been attempted to be shown that Drs. White and Knox were called in to visit her." But she, in her statement, under oath, swears she did acknowledge the "authority" and I positively assert, that it was at her request they were called in. I therefore consider from my personal knowledge of the subject that there was no "improper interference," on the part of Drs. White and Knox; and that their conduct, in the whole affair, was praise-worthy and not censurable, so far as the subject came under my notice.

As to Mrs. Dugan's being cured, before she left St. Louis, I can hardly account for such a mistake, (if indeed, it be a mistake.) She was not cured, neither did I believe she ever would be cured; not having seen her since, I cannot say whether my opinion was well founded or not. I am informed she is still afflicted. He further remarks, "She gave me to understand that Dr. White and his associates had in-

terfered in her case, had condemned my opinions and treatment and sought to induce her to discharge me, and retain them in attendance." In reference to the above, I can only say that, as far as it relates to "Doctor" White and his associates "intruding" in her case, if she made the above statement to Dr. Adreon, she must have been guilty of a notorious falsehood: I understand she denies making any such statement. So far was Dr. White from intruding in her case, that it was at my earnest solicitation that he and Dr. Knox visited her; and not then, until they were assured the suffering woman considered herself without a physician; as she, (from her own statement to me,) had not been visited for three days; complained of the injury done her, and also of her abandonment; so that it was at her own request, through my agency, that those gentlemen called to see her. As far as I am concerned, I acted in good faith, and was prompted by a sense of duty, in all my acts toward her; how far human weakness and suffering may have prompted her to make the above statement to Dr. Adreon, I am not prepared to say, or what advantage may have been taken of her situation, I know not; but that she should wilfully be guilty of such a gross falsehood, is passing strange to me; between her and Dr. Adreon the matter rests. That Dr. White should "condemn" Dr. Adreon's "opinions" and "treatment" of her case, is not to be wondered at, whether told by Mrs. Dugan or any other person; as he has expressed (as far as I have knowledge of the subject) but one opinion in reference to both the "opinions" and treatment of the case.

He further states, "I have always believed that Drs. White and Knox's interference was dishonorable, as professional men, and arose from vindictive feelings." If such has "always" been his belief of the acts and motives of these gentlemen, in their attentions to Mrs. Dugan, as I firmly believe, that his faith is founded on mistaken or wrong testimony; and certainly lacks that charity that "thinketh no evil." In their whole conduct, in reference to this matter, as far as it came under my notice, they have been actuated, by principles of disinterested benevolence, and as high minded, honorable men in their profession.

Thus far I have thought it my duty to state, that the subject, as far as I am concerned, or have knowledge of it, may stand on its proper merits; and that no innocent individual suffer through mistake, or otherwise.

Very respectfully, &c.,

GEO. C. LIGHT.

APPENDIX—(*Vermiformis*.)

Since the preceding article was written, Dr. Adreon has published "A Reply to a publication of Dr. Knox." As Dr. Knox announced in his "publication" that he would pay no attention to any future abuse from that quarter, unless some evidence were produced to substantiate the charges made against him; and, as Dr. Adreon's pamphlet is all abuse (and billingsgate at that) I presume he will not think fit to notice it. I propose, very briefly, to do so; simply to show to what a depth of degradation it is possible for the human mind to descend, when

once it leaves the path of truth; and, further, to prove that both Drs. Adreon and Reyburn have told one truth, viz: "That liars should have good memories." For no other reason should I notice this disgusting exhibition of mendacity.

The first three pages of Dr. A.'s pamphlet are occupied with the attempt to show that Dr. K.'s recent public statement is contrary to that given before the court, because he did not then give an account of what Mrs. Dugan told him of the history of her disease—when he knew (for he was present and heard it) that Dr. Knox was specially prohibited by the court from doing so. He also asserts that my testimony contradicted that of Dr. K., which any person who was in court knows to be false. The unblushing impudence required to state things, known by the whole community to be false, is past comprehension.

Running through the whole article is a constant succession of changes rung on the assertion that the witnesses who testified to the facts of the case, in my former article, in the "St. Louis Med. & Surg. Journal," were "seduced by the glittering bait of \$10,000 damages;" when it is perfectly well known to the whole community that the suit was determined, and all chance of "damages" forever at an end, before my article appeared containing that testimony! Was ever mortal man before seen, who had sunk so low, as thus boldly to state what every reader must know to be false? But there is yet a deeper depth, strange as it may seem. He has even had the effrontery to pretend to quote from Dr. K.'s publication, and enclose passages in marks of quotation, when not quoted correctly. In one instance, (see 12th page of his "reply," near the bottom) he not only marks a passage as a quotation, but, to make the lie doubly strong, says, "I will repeat the consolation he gave the woman, that my readers may judge," &c., &c. He then quotes a part of a sentence, omitting all the essential part of the "consolation," and not content even with that, he, to suit his own purposes, alters some of the language, as any one may see, by turning to the 5th page of Dr. Knox's "vindication." Can there be yet a still lower deep and a still more unblushing disregard of truth? Aye! it is even so!! On the 16th page of his "reply," Dr. A. states that Dr. K., when he (A.) called on him (K.) for an explanation "in 1840," spoke to him, in the presence of Dr. Martin, of the note, from Rev. Mr. Light: Yet, just sixteen lines below, on the same page, he says, "The note was never spoken of or shown, until the trial, so no one knows when it was written—probably first for the occasion." Truly, "liars should have good memories." At least gentlemen, it would have been prudent to have compared notes!!

Dr. Adreon talks most magniloquently of his courage; yet he has sat quietly for months, under the direct charge from Dr. Knox, of being a wilful, deliberate liar, a charge publicly proclaimed throughout the city; but "*canes timidi vehementius latrant.*"

Page 20, Adreon's reply—"I have never sought testimony against him (Knox) or others connected with this case." Charles Zoller, a worthy German, asserted to me in the presence of Dr. Stirman, that Dr. Adreon called repeatedly to see him for the purpose of eliciting evidence in the Dugan case; and I presume Dr. Adreon will not pretend to controvert the fact, that he not only asked Dr. Sykes verbally, but, in the most urgent manner solicited him, in writing, to write for publica-

tion, as strong a letter as he (Sykes) could possibly dictate, upon the subject of the Dugan controversy, and the alleged improper interference of myself and Dr. Knox, to which Dr. Sykes replied. Why did he not publish that letter? For the proof of the fact, I refer to Dr. Sykes himself and to Dr. Jacobson and many others, who saw the letter and heard the declaration from the Doctor. Thus is the epithet of "base and wilful falsehood" made to recoil upon its appropriate author, S. W. Adreon.

Dr. Simmons denies having ever made to Dr. Reyburn, or any one else, such an imputation as that charged on his authority, on the 15th page of Adreon's Discussion; and Dr. Martin emphatically denies all knowledge of the statement made on his authority, on the 16th page. He affirms that he did not even know that Dr. A. was about to publish anything on the subject; and gives entirely a different version of the whole affair of the interview at Dr. Knox's office, in 1840. He understood Dr. A. as being perfectly satisfied with Dr. K's. explanation. I cheerfully refer the public to these gentlemen, (Drs. S. and M.) for a true statement of these matters.

Page 16, Dr. Adreon's pamphlet.—"When asked by Dr. Reyburn, at the time he visited the patient, I gave him *dates* as nearly as they occurred to me. Had I known his intention of making *notes* I might have taxed my memory more closely."

Page 18.—"When I state that neither Dr. Beaumont nor myself ever knew of his (Dr. Reyburn) having made notes of the case, until his paper was about being read before the Medical Society, and that whatever he has written was without our knowledge, wish, or suggestion, it will be seen how much he was influenced in the matter by either of us."

Dr. R's. Supplement, page 2.—"Now my own statement of the case has not depended on the precarious tenure of memory alone, but was made out from notes taken in the earliest period of the disease;" and page 55, May No. Medical and Surgical Journal, Dr. R. says, "The narrator (Dr. R.) saw the case in the middle of the month of June," (1840.)

Dr. Reyburn took "notes in the earliest period of the disease," yet did not see the case at all for near two months after the operation, when, to use his own language, "The patient's health was re-established," and Dr. Adreon says whatever Dr. R. wrote "was without the knowledge, wish, or suggestion of either himself or Dr. Beaumont." Whence, then, the "unalterable evidence of the note-book?" Were they not "produced first for the occasion" in 1843? From the discrepancy in their statements, and the fact that Dr. Sykes asserts that no notes were taken, the public will be at no loss in deciding. Surely, I have no cause to exclaim, "O, that mine enemy had written a book!" Were they to write one or two more, they would deny *all* they have ever asserted.

Again, I express heart-felt regret at the necessity of exposing the errors and turpitude of my assailants, on my own account, as well as the honor and dignity of my profession; more especially so, as I have been compelled (from the nature of the charges, and the character of my vilifiers,) to use language grating to my own feelings, and under other circumstances, repulsive to a refined literary taste; but in the base conduct of my accusers, will the profession and community find my apology.

